

WAR NEWS COVERAGE
A STUDY OF ITS DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

by

PUNLEY HUSTON YANG

B.L., National Chengchi University
Taipei, China, 1961

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Technical Journalism

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

1968

Approved by:


Major Professor

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to the many persons whose guidance, suggestions, and services have helped to make possible the completion of this thesis. First of all, I am immeasurably indebted to Mr. Del Brinkman for his suggestions, criticism, and patience.

I would also like to acknowledge Dr. F. V. Howe as a member of my Advisory Committee, and Professor Ralph Lashbrook as Chairman of the Committee for the Oral Examination. I wish to thank Helen Hostetter for her suggestions on the style of the thesis and English polishing. I wish to extend my thanks for Kim Westfahl's tremendous typing.

Finally, sincere appreciation is due the Lyonses, the Masons, and Myrna Hoogenhous for their continual encouragement in the school years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	ii
INTRODUCTION	v
Chapter	
I. A WAR CORRESPONDENT'S PORTRAIT	1
II. EARLY PERIOD: WAR CORRESPONDENTS IN THE 19th CENTURY.	6
III. COVERAGE OF THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR	14
IV. COVERAGE OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR.	26
V. COVERAGE OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR	40
VI. COVERAGE OF THE KOREAN WAR	63
VII. COVERAGE OF THE VIETNAM WAR.	75
VIII. CONCLUSION	98
BIBLIOGRAPHY	100

.... And let me speak to the yet unknowing World
How these things came about: so shall you hear
Of carnal, bloody and unnatural acts,
Of accidental judgments, casual slaughters,
Of deaths put on by cunning and forced cause,
And, in this upshot, purposes mistake
Fall'n on the inventors' heads: all this can I
truly deliver.

---William Shakespeare, Hamlet V, 2

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is twofold. In the first place, it is intended to summarize what the American war correspondents have written about--freemen fighting for a free world. Secondly, it is an evaluation of the activities and literary works of the war correspondents.

An evaluation of a war correspondent's work involved two major considerations. The first is a thorough examination of the war correspondent's life, his major assignment, and his social environment. Second, the investigator needs to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the contemporary materials. The particular methodology employed in analyzing the contemporary materials will be determined by the work involved and the objectives of the study.

The war correspondent provides an especially interesting subject for an investigation of historical development. He has been active in the battle fields and has professed a high degree of journalistic commitment. Moreover, he has produced a vast amount of narrative, all of which is the true history of our time.

This paper includes a comparative study of three major fields: the history of American journalism, autobiographies, and the famous journalistic novels. Furthermore, this paper tries to present the war correspondent as an eye-witness for future historians.

CHAPTER I

A WAR CORRESPONDENT'S PORTRAIT

When one thinks of the dangers which lie in the path of a journalist, the mind turns first to the war correspondent, and after that to the special or travelling correspondent whose work takes him among uncivilized people. They risk their lives so constantly and are so often in the public eye and mind that people must generally wonder what sort of men they are.

The position of the war correspondent has indeed always been a most difficult one, and in addition has been growing to be increasingly complicated, since so many different and warring factors are involved in his work. His duty is assigned, it is not merely the routine transcriptions or the announcements made by the press officers. It is a difficult and demanding job, requiring long hours of work at periods in both the day and night. These periods are often inconvenient for anybody whose health is poor. The reporter must be a clearheaded, cool, sensible man. A contemporary journalist said that a war correspondent "is a citizen of the world. His nationality is effaced by the fact that he knows all countries."¹

¹Julian Ralph, The Making of a Journalist, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1903), p. 77.

The war correspondent is never too insignificant to escape the notice of the government;² the war office regards him as its arch enemy;³ army officers deem him an interloper;⁴ the troops complain that they are not adequately noticed by him;⁵ the censor wields his blue pencil and mercilessly strikes out the most telling paragraphs;⁶ the general public is prone to consider him omniscient while criticizing him for not providing on tap fresh and important news;⁷ to his own newspaper he is a valuable but expensive asset;⁸ to himself, the war correspondent would not be worth sending to the front if he did not consider his work sufficiently important to justify all the attention it receives from all the circles that it touches.⁹ The problem of squaring the circle is not more hopeless than is that of harmonizing all these

²Robert W. Desmond, The Press and World Affairs, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1937), p. 74.

³The New York Times, August 19, November 16, 1914, May 24, 1915.

⁴W. F. P. Napier, History of the War in the Peninsula, (London, The Macmillan Company, 1882), Vol. II, pp. 237-8. Memoirs of Henry Villard, Vol. I, p. 209, Vol. II, pp 237-8, and also Frank L. Mott, American Journalism; a History of Newspaper in the United States, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 4th ed. 1964), pp. 336-8, 351-9.

⁵Perceval Landon, "War Correspondents and the Censorship," 19th Century and After. 52 (August, 1902), 327-37.

⁶Edward Cook, The Press in War Time, (London: The Macmillan Company, 1920), pp. 32-45.

⁷G. O. Villard, "Press as affected by the War," Review of Reviews, 51(January, 1915), pp. 79-83.

⁸Ralph, Journalist, pp. 1-14.

⁹Ibid., p. 9.

mutually contradictory elements in the work of the war correspondent.

The functions of the early war correspondents were not indeed the same as those of the war correspondent of a later day, yet the steps in the evolution of the one from the other may be clearly seen and to his long career may perhaps be in part ascribed the continued activity of the war correspondent in the field of journalism.¹⁰ His speedy disappearance has often been predicted, and collectively he has found a place in the newspaper "morgue."¹¹ His work has called forth the satire of writers for the press in other lines,¹² and he has repeatedly been told that the public has ceased to be interested in his work.¹³ Yet with each recurring conflict between warring nations he finds a place, and his letters appear in the daily press.

The war correspondent not only indignantly denies the justice of the criticisms of his work, but he points with pride to his achievements,¹⁴ to his subordination of himself to his newspaper, to his successful co-operation with his co-workers on other papers

¹⁰Henry C. Robinson, Reminiscences and Correspondents, (London: The Macmillan Company, 1869), p. 61.

¹¹F. L. Bullard, Famous War Correspondents, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1941), p. 3.

¹²Matthew Arnold, Friendship's Garland, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1903), pp. 313-314.

¹³G. B. Dibblee, The Newspaper, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), p. 71.

¹⁴G. W. Smalley, Anglo-Saxon Memories, (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911), pp. 216-7.

and to their organization of the entire field of war correspondence.¹⁵ He insists that he realizes the costliness of war correspondence to his employers, but that he is not wilfully or unnecessarily extravagant,¹⁶ that it is unfair to condemn the best of the profession for the sins of the few, that, in spite of the fact that "the war correspondent practiced camouflage long before the present war introduced the word and the idea to readers of English,"¹⁷ his standards of truth and honor¹⁸ as well as of his personal and technical qualifications for the work are the highest.¹⁹ He is proud of the long list of distinguished men who have been war correspondents and he rejoices that he is one of the guild.

What is the real image of a war correspondent? He has been portrayed by one of the greatest of them all. "In my day dreams," says Archibald Forbes, "indulged in mostly when smarting under the consciousness of my own deficiencies, I have tried to think out the attributes that ought to possess the gift of tongues--to be conversant with all European languages, a neat assortment of the Asiatic languages, and a few of the African tongues, such as

¹⁵H. Perry Robinson, "A War Correspondent on His Work," 19th Century and After. 82(December, 1917), pp. 1205-15.

¹⁶Mott, American Journalism, pp. 537-9.

¹⁷S. Strunsky, "War Notes from a Newspaper Desk," Atlantic Monthly, 116(September, 1915), pp. 401,10.

¹⁸Robinson, "A War Correspondent on His Work," p. 1213.

¹⁹Ralph, Journalist, pp. 86-97.

Abyssinian, Ashantee, Zulu, and Soudanese. He should have the sweet, angelic temper of a woman, and be as affable as if he were a politician canvassing for a vote; yet, at the same time, be big and ugly enough to impress the conviction that it would be highly unwise to take any liberties with him. The paragon war correspondent should be able to ride anything that chance may offer, from a giraffe to a rat; be able to ride a hundred miles at a stretch, to go without food for a week if needful, and without sleep for as long; never to get tired--never to feel the sensation of a slight sinking, you know; and be able at the end of the ride--of a journey however long, arduous, and sleepless--to write round-hand for a foreign telegraph clerk ignorant of the correspondent's language, at the rate of a column an hour for six or eight consecutive hours; after which he should, as a matter of course, gallop back to the scene of action without an hour's delay."²⁰

²⁰Archibald Forbes, Memories and Studies of War and Peace, (London: Johnston, 1896), pp. 2-3.

CHAPTER II

EARLY PERIOD: WAR CORRESPONDENTS IN THE 19th CENTURY

The first war correspondent actually to be sent by a newspaper appears to have been an unidentified representative of the Swedish Intelligencer, which was among the earliest European newspapers. He went into the field in 1807 with the forces of King Gustavus Adolphus.¹

The London Times sent Henry Crabb Robinson to the Continent in 1807. He was in Germany and Spain from which he reported wars. His assignment seemed to represent both first major special correspondence and the first war correspondence.²

Charles Lewis Gruneisen, representing the Morning Post of London, went to cover the Carlist wars in Spain in 1837. Despite the precedents set by Robinson and Gruneisen, no English papers covered the Afghan campaigns of 1838-1842, or the first and second Punjab wars, and it was not until William Howard Russell went to the Crimean war for the Times in 1854 that the coverage was resumed.³

¹Desmond, The Press and World Affairs, pp. 11-35, and John Hohenberg, Foreign Correspondents; the Great Reporters and Their Times, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964), pp. 1-7.

²W. D. Bowman, The Story of the Times, (London: The Macmillan Company, 1941), pp. 98-108.

³T. H. S. Escott, Masters of English Journalism, (London: T. F. Unwin, 1911), pp. 82-5.

Russell's experiences in the Crimean war are said to have started war correspondence.⁴ He was described as "the first special correspondent," and "the first and greatest of war correspondents."⁵

There were a number of wars which attracted some attention after the Crimean war. First was the Serbian Campaign of 1876, followed by the Russo-Turkish conflict of 1877-1878, and other campaigns in the Balkans and the Near East, in which participated such famed war correspondents as Archibald Forbes, Januarius Aloysius MacGohn, and Frederic Villiers. The first two represented the Daily News of London, Villiers was a war artist for the London Graphic.⁶

There were Near Eastern and Balkan adventurers during the late years of the nineteenth century, in which Edmond O'Donovan, for one, took an active part. There were the Egyptian campaigns of 1883, in which some of the correspondents already mentioned again were active, and in which Bennet Burleigh of the Daily Mail; Winston Churchill, then representing the Morning Post; and to one or two American correspondents, such as Julian Ralph and Richard Harding Davis.⁷ The Times gave fine coverage of that war which included some special and excellent accounts of important battles.⁸

⁴Desmond, The Press and World Affairs, p. 20.

⁵Hohenberg, Foreign Correspondence, p. 73.

⁶J. B. Williams, History of English Journalism, (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1908), p. 103.

⁷Mott, American Journalism, p. 580.

Reuters' report of the relief of Mafeking, coming well in advance of any official announcement, was one of the great journalistic triumphs⁹ of the War and a great credit to the organization, although name of the correspondent responsible is unknown.

The newspapers in the United States between 1808 and 1854 marked important progress. The coverage of the campaigns and incidents of the War of 1812-1814 was, however, almost as haphazard as that of the Revolutionary War. Organized war correspondence was unheard of. But the Kentuckian James, former editor of the Orleans Gazette, who had established the Time Piece at St. Francisville, Louisiana, just before the war, has some claim to the title of war correspondent--perhaps the first in the American journalism.¹⁰

The great running story of war news at this time was that of the Napoleonic wars. The American war with England, a part of the general world war, presented a series of thrilling victories and dismaying defeats which whipped up a high degree of interest in news but which brought out very little brilliant reporting.¹¹ With fortuitous and haphazard war correspondence, no professional pride in such work was to be expected.

There was other war news, too; the naval war with the Barbary States and the Indian wars in the Northwest and in Florida, and

⁸The Times, History of the Times, (London: The Times, 1952), p. 89.

⁹Hohenberg, Foreign Correspondence, p. 142.

¹⁰Mott, American Journalism, p. 196.

¹¹Ibid., p. 199.

finally the Black Hawk war, of 1832, produced stories of the first magnitude. The purchase of Louisiana in 1803, the acquisition of Florida in 1819-21, western emigration thrusts, and the great Oregon boundary dispute all threatened or involved war issues.

James Gordon Bennett, who founded the New York Herald in 1835, was credited with the chief developments in American war correspondence.¹² During the Mexican War of 1846 to 1848, his correspondence system functioned very well, especially with the telegraph, which had become practicable in 1844, to speed news from Washington to New York.¹³

The outstanding Mexican War correspondent was George W. Kendall, who was honored as "the first modern war correspondent."¹⁴ He was a Yankee printer who had worked on Washington papers and on Greeley's New Yorker. He was at the fall of Monterey and the battle of Buena Vista; in the former engagement, he captured a Mexican flag which he sent home to his paper as a trophy. He witnessed the capture of Vera Cruz, accompanied Scott on his march on Mexico City, and was wounded in the knee in the last battle of the war.

The American Civil War brought war correspondents into active service and competition was overwhelming. Newspapers made

¹²Desmond, The Press and World Affairs, p. 16, and Mott, American Journalism, pp. 229-38.

¹³Desmond, The Press and World Affairs, p. 21, and Mott, American Journalism, p. 239.

¹⁴Hohenberg, Foreign Correspondence, pp. 40-3, Mott, American Journalism, p. 249-50, and Desmond, The Press and World Affairs, p. 21.

extraordinary efforts to bring the war news to their readers. More than 150 war correspondents reported from the field.¹⁵ Only the New York Herald spent more than half a million dollars to cover the war.¹⁶ As Albert Deane Richardson of the New York Tribune wrote later, their war correspondents "styled themselves the Bohemian Brigade, and exhibited that touch of the vagabond which Irving charitably attributes to poetic temperaments."¹⁷

The northern newspapers had organized the coverage of the war from their home offices. Editors of some of the northern papers took their turns as war correspondents in the field. Among these were Henry J. Raymond of the New York Times; Whitelaw Reid of the Cincinnati Gazette (later editor of the Tribune); Joseph Medill of the Chicago Tribune; Murat Halstead of the Cincinnati Commercial; and John Russell Young, after the war a brilliant managing editor of the New York Tribune at twenty-five years of age, of the Philadelphia Press.

Among those war correspondents in the Civil War, George W. Smalley, the lawyer-journalist, representing the New York Tribune, was one of the more famous.¹⁸ At the battle of Antietam, Smalley rode with General Hooker, carried dispatches for him and lost two horses by gunfire. His account of the battle has been acclaimed

¹⁵Mott, American Journalism, p. 332.

¹⁶Hohenberg, Foreign Correspondence, p. 63.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 64.

¹⁸Desmond, The Press and World Affairs, p. 22, Mott, American Journalism, p. 335, and Hohenberg, Foreign Correspondence, pp. 69-72.

by good judges to be one of the greatest battle-stories that came out of the war.¹⁹

The most famous naval correspondent of the war was B. S. Osbon.²⁰ He was first hired by the New York World, then by the Herald, and he supplied the former paper with a beat what of the first magnitude when he brought in an eye-witness account of the surrender of Fort Sumter. Osbon was an artist as well as a writer, and furnished many sketches for Harper's Weekly.

Probably no great war has ever been so thoroughly covered by eye-witness correspondents as was the American Civil War. Newspapers have printed far greater volumes of material about later wars, and more prompt and accurate news; but Civil War conditions allowed for more uncensored, on-the-scene reporting than did those of latter wars.²¹

It would be wrong to idealize the Civil War correspondents, however, and think of them all as heroes.²² A contemporary journalist, speaking of how they were sometimes driven out of certain army corps and "forced to hover around the rear of the armies, gathering up such information as they could," concludes: "There were honorable and talented exceptions, but the majority of those who called themselves war correspondents were mere news-scavengers."²³ Somewhere between this estimate and that of the leading

¹⁹Mott, American Journalism, p. 335.

²⁰Ibid., p. 336. ²¹Ibid., p. 329.

²²Ibid., p. 336. ²³Ibid., p. 337.

historian of war correspondence to the effect that the Civil War afforded "the heroic age of newspaper enterprise," the true appraisal doubtless lies.²⁴

American newspapers covered the Civil War in detail. The increasing use of the electric telegraph, as it was cabled, helped speed dispatches and fed the fires of public interest in the struggle, and sent American newspaper circulations mounting rapidly.²⁵

After the Civil War, Smalley was sent to Europe in 1866 as the New York Tribune's "foreign commissioner" to stay in London.²⁶ He was to introduce American journalistic methods--telegraphic transmission--which he had learned during the Civil War and first applied at Antietam to the British empire and Europe. The revolutionary methods were demonstrated with brilliant success to the amazement of journalistic leaders of the Old World.²⁷ His victory was complete. The world news revolution was finally under way. The race, as Smalley has said, was truly to the swift, the battle to the strong.²⁸

In the century since Bennett set up his foreign commissioner in Europe, it may be said that there has been a constant growth in the service of information provided for the public, especially

²⁴Ibid., p. 338.

²⁵Desmond, The Press and World Affairs, p. 22.

²⁶Hohenberg, Foreign Correspondence, p. 76.

²⁷Ibid., p. 79.

²⁸Ibid., p. 80.

by certain newspapers and press associations in Anglo-Saxon countries.²⁹

By the time of the Boer War, the Spanish-American War, and the Russo-Japanese War more newspapers, and more press associations, were sending able, especially trained war correspondents afield.³⁰

²⁹Desmond, The Press and World Affairs, p. 35.

³⁰Ibid., p. 36.

CHAPTER III

COVERAGE OF THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

The Mexican War not only put the news in newspapers, but it developed war correspondents who put heart-throbs into their stories. In the war with Spain, the American war correspondent reached his highest development. American commanders allowed unusual freedom to war correspondents.¹ It was a small war, and thus not too difficult to cover. Probably no greater army correspondents had ever been mobilized for any war than those who covered the activities of the blocking fleet, gathered at the Florida camps, followed Shafter into Cuba, sent the news from Spain, and sailed with Admiral Dewey to Manila.

Arthur Brisbane has told what it meant to report that conflict in the American press. It meant, to quote his own words:

"To cover the field of possible action in advance from Manila to Porto Rico; to place the right man in the right place, select the man through intuition; to secure boats and arrange telegraphic facilities; to get the news into the office first, into the newspapers first, on the street and all over the country first; to sift the kernel of fact from the mass of rumors; to exercise discretion and reasonable conservatism without falling behind in the great fight for news priority and supremacy; to meet the mechanical facilities; and--with the weaker papers--to meet with limited capital the problem of expense unlimited, to make mental resources replace the hard money sinews of the newspaper war reporter."²

¹Mott, American Journalism, pp. 527-39.

²James M. Lee, History of American Journalism, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, rev. ed. 1923), pp. 364-7.

When the Maine was blown up in February, 1898, American newspapers began preparations to cover a war. President McKinley finally asked Congress to decide; the Senate vote for war on April 19, 1898, was 42-35, while the House whooped it up to 310-6.³

More than 500 writers, photographers, and artists, representing scores of newspapers and magazines were in the forefront and were deployed into the Cuban hinterlands. These war correspondents were more than needed to cover the entire four years of the Civil War.⁴ Some of these men were famous writers, such as Stephen Crane, Richard Harding Davis, Frank Morris, John Fox, Stephen Bonsal, and Julian Hawthorne. Others were famous artists, as R. F. Zogbaum, Frederick Remington, W. A. Rogers, and John T. McCutcheon. However, some were seasoned war reporters: Creelman, Davis, Scovel, Edward Marshall, Murat Halstead, and others.

The reporting of the victory at Manila Bay was credited to H. W. Harden, a veteran correspondent of the New York World. It was known that Admiral Dewey's Asiatic Squadron had fought and defeated the Spanish at Manila Bay probably on May 1, but with the cable communications cut off, no authentic news was possible. For six days the wildest rumors prevailed. The nation was torn between pride and deepest concern over American losses.

³W. A. Swanberg, Citizen Hearst, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961), p. 144.

⁴Mott, American Journalism, p. 534, and Bullard, Famous War Correspondents, p. 417.

Upon this tense period of waiting there broke, on the morning of May 7, a special dispatch exclusively printed in the New York World, which gave the world its first information:

"Hongkong, May 7: I have just arrived here on the United States revenue cutter Hugh McCulloch, with my report of the greatest American triumph at Manila.

"The entire Spanish fleet of eleven vessels was destroyed.

"Three hundred Spaniards were killed and four hundred wounded.

"Our loss was none killed but six slightly wounded.

"Not one of the American ships was injured.

E. W. Harden"⁵

This initial triumph of the war was speeded all over the earth. Indeed, Anglo-American cable officials estimated that the message credited always to the World, was read within half a day by 500,000,000 people in the Eastern and Western Hemispheres. The next morning, the White House issued this announcement:

"The New York World apparently had the only information to be had on the subject and it would be wise for the Navy Department to depend upon it for its information. William McKinley"⁶

Hearst spent a half-million dollars covering the war itself. He took charge of a fleet of ten dispatch boats and a band of twenty-five writers, artists, and photographers. Among them were Richard Harding Davis, the most popular American novelist of his day, James Creelman, the star reporter who exposed the Japanese massacre at Port Arthur for the World,⁷

⁵John L. Heaton, The Story of A Page; Thirty Years of Public Service and Public Discussion in the Editorial Columns of the New York World, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1917), p. 165.

⁶James W. Barrett, Joseph Pulitzer & His World, (New York: The Vanguard Press, Inc., 1941), pp. 177-9.

Edward Marshall, and Frederick Remington, famous artist who was the hero of the famous pre-war cable from Cuba to Hearst: "Everything is quiet. There is no trouble here. There will be no war. I wish to return." To which Hearst replied: "Please remain. You furnish the pictures, and I'll furnish the war."⁸

Hearst himself went to the Cuban front as a war correspondent. He swung into action himself with a 3,000-word piece for the Journal of June 29 on the situation before Santiago. Just two days later, the icy-calm, six-foot two-inch publisher and Creelman were together under fire at the battle of El Caney while Davis was following the fortunes of war with Roosevelt's Rough Riders up San Juan Hill.

Hearst, as a war correspondent, covered on-the-spot news printed in the New York Journal and the San Francisco Examiner on July 4, 1898, and signed by Hearst:

"By William Randolph Hearst

"With the army in front of Santiago, July 1, midnight, via Kingston, Jamaica--

"Tonight as I write, ambulance trains are bringing wounded soldiers from the fierce battle around the little village of El Caney.

"Siboney, the base of the army, is a hospital, and nothing more. There is no saying when the slaughter will cease. Tents are crowded with wounded, and hard-worked surgeons are busy with medical work. There is an order of antiseptics, and ambulances clatter through one narrow street.

"Under the fierce firing of far heavier artillery than it was supposed the Spanish had, the American infantry and dismounted calvary have done their work

⁷Hohenberg, Foreign Correspondence, pp. 176-82.

⁸James Creelman, On the Great High Way, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1901), pp. 177-8.

and done it nobly.

"I have been at the artillery positions all day to see what our guns could do. There is no question of the skill and courage of American gunmen. Their work is as near perfect as gunnery gets to be, but there was no artillery to speak of. The War Department furnished the necessary heavy guns, but they remained in the rear because of the difficulty of transportation from the coast.

"We found that a shrapnel ball had passed clean through one of our cans of pressed beef which our pack mule was carrying.

"We turned to the right toward our battery on the ridge. When we were halfway to the battery, the second shell which the Spaniards fired burst over the American battery not ten feet over the heads of our men. Six of our fellows were killed and sixteen wounded. The men in the battery wavered for a moment, then rallied and returned to their guns and the firing went on.

"We passed to the right again where General Shafter's war balloon was ascending. Six shells landed in this vicinity, and then our battery ceased firing. The smoke clouds from our guns were forming too plain a target for the Spaniards. There was no trace to be seen of the enemy's battery because of their use of smokeless powder.

"Off to the far right of our line of formation Colonel Capron's artillery which had come through from Daiquiri without rest could observe military operations, so we directed our course thither.

"We found Colonel Capron blazing away with four guns where he should have had a dozen. He had begun shelling El Caney at four o'clock in the morning. It was now noon, and he was still firing. He was aiming to reduce the large stone fort which stood on the hill above the town and command it.

"Colonel O'Connel had laid a wager that the first shot of some one of the four guns would hit the fort, but it is not yet reduced. It became weakened, however....

"When I left the fort to hunt for Creelman, I found him bloody and bandaged, lying on his back on a blanket on the ground, but shown all care that a kindly skillful surgeon could give him. He was pretty well dazed and said, 'I am afraid I can't write much of a story. If you will write it for me, I will describe it the best I can.'⁹

⁹William Randolph Hearst, William Randolph Hearst; A Portrait of His Own Words. Edited by Edmond D. Coblentz, (New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1952), pp. 54-7.

This is one of Hearst's few published examples of his on-the-spot news coverage.

There was also the famous incident in which the Journal's veteran correspondent, James Creelman, led an assault on a fort at El Caney; wounded in his successful charge, he was taken to the rear. He recorded what happened next a considerable time afterward:

"Someone knelt in the grass beside me and put his hand on my fevered head. Opening my eyes, I saw Mr. Hearst, the proprietor of the New York Journal, a straw hat with a bright ribbon on his head, a revolver at his belt, and a pencil and note book in his hand. The man who had provoked the war had come to see the result with his own eyes and, finding one of his correspondents prostrate, was doing the works himself. Slowly he took down my story of the fight. Again and again the tinging of Mauser bullets interrupted. But he seemed unmoved. The battle had to be reported somehow.

"'I am sorry you're hurt, but,'--and his face was radiant with enthusiasm--'wasn't it a splendid fight? We must beat every paper in the world.'"¹⁰

Creelman was not the only headline hero that day. Davis made Theodore Roosevelt famous for leading the charge up San Juan Hill and did some more fighting on his own. He wrote:

"I speak of Roosevelt first because...Roosevelt, mounted high on horseback, and charging the rifle pits at a gallop and quite alone made you feel that you would like to cheer. He wore on his sombrero a blue polkadot handkerchief.... While, as he advanced,¹¹ floated straight behind his head, like a guidon."

Davis also made a confession about the battle of San Juan Hill in a letter home:

¹⁰Creelman, Great Highway, pp. 196-212.

¹¹Richard Harding Davis, Notes of A War Correspondent, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933), pp. 95-7.

"I got excited and took a carbine and charged the sugar house (on San Juan Hill). If the men had been regulars, I would have sat in the rear as (Stephen) Crane did but I knew every one of them, had played football and all that sort of thing, so I thought as an American I ought to help."¹²

It was, all in all, rather difficult to decide which correspondent had carried off top honors in the field that day-- Davis or Creelman or Hearst or some of their equally active associates and rivals. But there was no doubt whatever about who had captured the fancy of the nation as a soldier. His name was Theodore Roosevelt.¹³

When Admiral Cervera's fleet was attacked and destroyed by American battleships, Hearst's flagship, *Silvia*, approached the battle field. After the action, finally he saw a score of figures huddled together in a cove of the beach. He shouted to them and some of the reporters made demonstrations with firearms. "The poor cowed fellows," wrote Hearst to the Journal, "with great alacrity waved a white handkerchief or shirt in token of surrender."¹⁴ His party had no difficulty in forcing the twenty-nine refugees to surrender. Hearst transported the prisoners on *Silvia* to Admiral Sampson who thanked him courteously and asked him to deliver the prisoners on board the *St. Louis*. Hearst complied, and received a receipt from the marine officer in charge. This receipt was forwarded to the Journal. Hearst's photographer,

¹²Ibid., pp. 99-104.

¹³Hohenberg, Foreign Correspondence, p. 135.

¹⁴Mrs. Fremont Older, William Randolph Hearst, American, (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, rev. ed., 1952), pp. 189-200.

Hemmant, was happy. He had pictures of Spanish prisoners kissing the American flag and cherring the victors. It was a great moment, duly recorded the next day in the New York Journal. But however theatrical Hearst's personal record as a war correspondent may sound, he at least proved that he was vitally interested in reporting the conflict, even at personal risk.

When the war was declared, the New York Sun chartered Kanapaha and sent her at once to Key West with its war correspondent team, which included Captain Packard, John R. Spears, Harold M. Anderson, Nelson Lloyd, Walstein Toot, Dana H. Carroll, and others. The Kanapaha was on her voyage with Admiral Sampson's fleet, the Sun sent Oscar King Davis with Admiral Schley's squadron and Thomas M. Dieuaide on board the Texas. Dieuaide got a splendid view of the great sea-fight of July 3, when Cervera came out of the harbor of Santiago, and he wrote the Sun's first detailed account of the destruction of the Spanish fleet.¹⁵

The Sun men ashore in Cuba were captained by W. J. Chamberlin, his force included R. M. Anderson, Carroll, and Root of the Sun, and Henry M. Armstrong and Acton Davis of the Evening Sun. The first American flag hoisted over Morro at Santiago was the property of the Sun.¹⁶

O. K. Davis was ordered to sail to Manila on the cruiser Charleston, which, on June 21, 1898, made the conquest of the

¹⁵Frank M. O'Brien, The Story of the Sun: New York, 1833-1918, (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1918), p. 353.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 356.

island of Guam. Davis was lucky to report this famous but bloodless victory in a two-page article which was exclusively the Sun's, and of which the Sun said editorially on August 9, 1898:

"No such story ever has been written or ever will be written of our conquest of the Ladroneas as that the Sun's correspondent, published yesterday morning. It is the picture of a historic scene, in which not a single detail is wanting. This far-away little isle of Guam so much out of the world that it had not heard of our war with Spain, and mistook the Charleston's shells for an honorary salute, is now a part of the United States of America, and destined to share in the greatness of a progressive country. The queer Spanish governor, who declined to go upon Captain Glass's ship because it would be a breach of Spanish regulations, is now our prisoner at Manila."¹⁷

The Associated Press war correspondents were under the direction of Colonel Charles S. Diehl who chartered five vessels: The Wanda, a yacht; the Dauntless; the Dandy; the Cynthia; and the Kate Spencer, all tugs.

The staff included Elmer E. Roberts, J. B. Nelson, Arthur W. Copp, Byron R. Newton, A. W. Lyman, J. W. Michell, Howard N. Thompson, H. L. Beach, Harold Martin, A. C. Goudie, G. E. Graham, W. A. M. Goode, H. C. Wright, Albert C. Hunt, J. C. Marriott, E. R. Johnstone, Oscar Watson, R. B. Creemer, and John P. Dunning. Dunning was a journalistic hero of the Samon disaster of 1891 and the only American correspondent to cover the Chilean Civil War in 1891. He was also on the U. S. S. Cloucester to interview the defeated Spanish Admiral Cervera after he had been picked up from the water near his disabled flagship. On the U.S.S. New York, flagship of the absent Admiral Sampson, William A. M. Goode, an

¹⁷Ibid., p. 357.

AP correspondent, as well as the other AP correspondents who were on the dispatch boat Dauntless, recorded the action.

Dunning had woven all the accounts into one complete story to which he put the complete AP file on the wire from Santiago to New York at the urgent rate of \$1.67 a word, the tolls were \$8,000. It was his triumph to beat his rivals.¹⁸

The naval victory at Santiago virtually ended the war. The city of Santiago surrendered on July 17, and an Associated Press correspondent, Alfred C. Goudie, who disguised himself as a Cuban refugee to get into the city, filed three thousand words describing the arrangements for the surrender, the march of refugees, the plight of the city, and the approach of the American forces. It was AP's exclusive report,¹⁹ because the military authority refused to permit newspapermen to enter before the formal occupation took place.

The press corps had been much depleted by that time. Of the two hundred correspondents who had landed with the troops in June to cover operations ashore, only nine remained. Three of them--Goudie, Martin, and Thompson--represented the Associated Press. The vicissitudes campaigning, the tropical climate, and the peril of yellow fever had driven the others home.

Thompson stayed on until 1902, when the American flag was hauled down from the palace in Havana and the flag of the new

¹⁸Hohenberg, Foreign Correspondence, p. 136.

¹⁹Oliver Gramling, AP, the Story of News, (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., 1940), p. 146.

independent Cuban Republic hoisted in its place, he wrote such a brilliant description of the occasion that the Congress by joint resolution unanimously ordered it printed in the Congressional Record as the official history of the event.²⁰

Except for that first great beat, the World had its troubles in covering the war. Stephen Crane, who was at a crucial point in the short war, embarrassed the World by telling the truth about the 71st New York Regiment at San Juan Hill. The New Yorker did not like this story.²¹ The most painful incident of all, as far as the World was concerned, was the conduct of its impulsive correspondent, Sylvester Scovel. He was barred from further contact with the American forces because of his insolent conduct in trying "to slap General Shafter."²² President McKinley later cleared him, but his usefulness to the World was, to put it mildly, impaired.

When the Spanish-American War came on, the New York Times and other newspapers lacked the resources to report the news as Hearst and Pulitzer did. These giants hired dispatch boats and extra men to go with the New York Regiments. They cluttered their columns with sensational war features. The Times only sent Bennett the Younger to this competition. The Times also gave prominent display to AP dispatches, which told the story of the

²⁰Ibid., p. 147.

²¹Don C. Seitz, Joseph Pulitzer: His Life and Letters, (New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1924), p. 241.

²²Margaret Leech, In the Days of McKinley, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), pp. 230, 270-1.

the war in adequate detail, but the coverage looked pale beside the offerings of The World, The Journal, and The Sun.

The number of war correspondents serving American papers abroad increased considerably with the conflicts over the world that followed the war with Spain. American war correspondents reported foreign wars in these years: The Boxer Rebellion in China in 1900, the Boer War in the same year, the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905. They gave very fine coverage of these wars. These wars had brought together again the old war horses who had covered the Spanish-American War. They included James Creelman, Julian Ralph, Stephen Crane, Richard H. Davis, Hugh Sutherland, John T. McCutcheon.

CHAPTER IV

COVERAGE OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

World War I fell into the period of sensation and adventure journalism. Reading through newspapers and magazines between 1914 and 1918, one finds a great number of disconnected stories: excellent reporting such as the piece by Richard Harding Davis on the German march through Brussels, or Irving Cobb's dispatches from the German front, or Floyd Gibbon's account of the sinking of the Laconia by a German U-Boat. Life for most war correspondents was "adventurous;" some of them were even captured and held as spies, though soon afterward they were released. In one instance American reporters even wrote a letter to the Kaiser. Ring Lardner was sent to Europe by the Chicago Tribune to cover the humorous aspects of the World War.

There was no complete coverage, however. There was hardly an attempt at coverage. The stories obtained by war correspondents at the front, in the trenches had little connection with one another.

During the First World War there was an almost complete absence of the analytical type of article with its searching inquiry into the strategic, political, economic, and social backgrounds of world events. The war correspondents of that time were not prepared for that type of job. They knew little of military matters and not much about economic or political problems and trends.

The public and the readers of the dispatches, during this conflict, were sitting rather far away. They were perhaps passionately interested spectators, but spectators nevertheless, who wished to be told exciting and adventurous stories.

The war correspondent's assignment in those days was not an easy one, but neither was it in the first line of danger. Rough terrain, deep mud during the rainy seasons, and difficulties of transportation made his work hard. The coverage of the main story seldom took the correspondents into the thick of the fighting. Robert Herrick, the American novelist, wrote for the New York Tribune, after a trip in the war zone. He expressed his view that "no correspondent or civilian writer has witnessed any real battle of this war.... They have all 'faked' more or less obviously. Many big war stories have been gathered in barrooms, cafes, railroad stations, many miles from the scenes they were supposed to relate. Gossip is dressed up cheaply with conventional inventions. They may give the American public what it wants to read, but they are poor novelists; they lack invention, and they copy each other."¹

Herrick's criticism of the "faking war literature which was cabled by the famous war correspondents" was replied to by Will Irwin, who produced the real sources of his powerful story of the battle of Ypres, in the New York Tribune. He started out by alleging that Herrick knew little of the "difficult art of

¹"Robert Herrick's Indictment of American War Correspondents," Current Opinion, 59(October, 1915), p. 265.

reporting."²

Herrick was unfair to state his criticism after having been in the War Zone only a short time. Except for the personal impressions' type of story, the best news-stories were usually written by men "who were not there." War correspondents who wrote the stories were not, of course, present at the event, yet they told their stories accurately. They went at the matter by the only means possible in the limited time at their disposal. They interviewed the survivors or eye-witness, looked over such inanimate circumstantial evidence as they could find, weighed this evidence with that sixth sense for truth and falsehood which a good war correspondent develops, and wrote a true and proportionate account. This is exactly the method which historians use, only the reporter has far less time at his disposal than the historian, and is, on the other hand, much nearer the event. In the conclusion of Irwin's reply to Herrick's criticism, he said that "Carlyle did not witness the French Revolution, but no one calls him faker for writing its history."³

When the First World War broke out, practically all the American daily newspapers were served news by the press associations. The bureau men in foreign capitals, who relied heavily for their materials on the local press and on the press associations in the countries in which they operated, were not equipped

²"Skeleton in the Newspaper Closet," Literary Digest, 51 (September 18, 1915), pp. 592-3.

³Ibid., pp. 592.

to cope with the sudden demand for large volumes of news from belligerent countries. Consequently, the press associations rushed scores of men to Europe late in July and early in August of 1914. These reporters were supplemented by an army of correspondents sent by large metropolitan newspapers and by magazines, and by free-lancers who sought to get a ring-side seat at the arena where the story of the century was unfolding.

The metropolitan papers which were considered leaders in the American press, could afford to send their own correspondents to Europe or to buy their foreign news from private sources abroad. They entered into agreements largely with the London dailies, and in turn sold the dispatches to other newspapers in the United States. These newspapers practically monopolized the business of serving middlemen for other daily newspapers in the United States. The New York Times, the New York World, the New York American, the Chicago Daily News, and the Chicago Tribune, for example, were available for the services of the English newspapers and in turn sold their services to other newspapers in the United States.

Among the old members of the fraternity of war correspondents, Richard Harding Davis and E. Alexander Powell were, perhaps, the more colorful of this group. Davis had won fame during the Spanish-American war by reporting hair-raising stories of atrocities in Cuba for Hearst's New York Journal. His dispatch describing the entrance of the German army into Brussels was one of the most vivid and stirring accounts contributed by any correspondent during the war. He wrote a colorful "eyewitness" story of

the tragedy of Louvain, the city that had been partly destroyed by the pitiless Germans, where "the women and children were being led to concentration camps and citizens were on their way to be shot."⁴

E. Alexander Powell was another brilliant writer who achieved renown early in the war. Because of his vivid and entertaining style, like Davis, he was successful immediately in distributing his articles throughout the United States to millions of readers. One of his most colorful descriptions was the entrance into Antwerp of the German army.⁵ His employers were greatly impressed by his ability. He was asserted "one of the few very great war correspondents" by the World's Almanac in 1914.

Other correspondents, not as theatrical as Davis and Powell, also saw the sun set early in the war on the roving correspondents and the impressionists. Edwin Emersim, back from the futile attempts to report events with the German army in Belgium, asserted that out of 78 cable dispatches sent to the New York World only four got past the censor.⁶ George A. Schneiner, languishing with the Austro-Hungarian army early in November, 1914, wrote that "the arrival of an empty envelope on the other side looks to us as a sign of decided improvement. Who said the pen was mightier than the sword?"⁷ Frederick Wile, correspondent for

⁴Fairfax Downey, Richard Harding Davis: His Day, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933), p. 266.

⁵E. Alexander Powell, Slanting Lines of Steel, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933), p. 105.

⁶Editor and Publisher, 14(February 27, 1915), p. 751.

American and London newspapers, had been requested by German officials early in the war to leave the country. He then became a militant advocate of American participation.⁸

The coverage of the war on the western front before American entered the war settled down to an exhausting, nerve-wracking routine. The AP and the UP had experts in the front, headed respectively by Elmer Roberts and Williams Philip Simms. The correspondents who were active in the frontline were Wythe Williams of the New York Times, Paul Scott Mowrer of the Chicago Daily News, Sisley Hyddleston of the Christian Science Monitor, Arno Dosch-Fleurot of the New York World, Stoddard Dewey of the New York Evening Post, who was dean of the corps, and Frederic Villiers, the war artist.⁹ Herbert Bayard Swope, the mercurial correspondent for the New York World, interviewed General Paul von Hindenburg after the German victory over the Russians at Tennenberg, toured the Somme on the German side, and wrote of the fighting there; this report helped him win a Pulitzer prize.¹⁰

The most moving stories of the war, according to neutral America as well as to others, were those written about Verdun

⁷Ibid., 14(January 2, 1915), p. 582.

⁸Fourth Estate, 1017(August 29, 1914), p. 2.

⁹Wythe Williams, Dusk Empire; the Decline of Europe and the Rise of the United States, as Observed by a Foreign Correspondent in a Quarter Century of Service, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), p. 56.

¹⁰Herbert Bayard Swope, Inside the German Empire, (New York: A. L. Burt Company, 1917), pp. 195-208.

¹¹Williams, Dusk Empire, p. 68.

by Gibbs, Wythe Williams, Paul Scott Mowrer, and their associates. No writer on the Allied side, standing in the presence of a generation of dead Frenchmen who had purchased a terrible victory with their sacrifices, could fail to be affected or fail in transmitting his feeling to his readers. Williams, returning from Verdun, quoted Koffre's statement at the Grand Quartier General, Chantilly, "I do not speak of the wounded. At Verdun, our losses were 460,000 killed, and the Germans 540,000. It is a field of a million dead."¹¹

There was, however, no king-making at the front. Sickened by the horrors of trench warfare, the tank and gas and heavy artillery attacks, and the enormous loss of life to gain a few feet of ground, the correspondents turned with a kind of relief to write of the air war. The Allied fliers, even the Germans, were pictured as knights of the air. They were romanticized almost beyond recognition even by the grimmest realists among the war correspondents...who helped create an image that long persisted in the public mind.

The Germans, suffering from the effects of the British blockade, began unrestricted submarine warfare early in 1917 and thus threw away the last chance they had to keep the United States neutral. The *Laconia* was sunk by a German submarine on February 25, 1917, and the United States was forced to enter the war on April 6, 1917.

America's entry into the War redoubled the importance of news coverage abroad. About forty American correspondents

covered the activities of the American Expeditionary Force.¹²

It was the courageous Floyd Gibbons, always disregarding his own safety, who nearly lost his life by going into combat. He entered Belleau Wood with the U. S. Marines and was hit three times by machine gun bullets, one gouging out an eye. This injury became his famous trademark. There was less glory still for the newspapermen who stayed in the ambulance corps. One of them, a young man from the Kansas City Star, Ernest Hemingway, was thankful he was able to survive the Italian campaign.¹³

Fred Ferguson of the UP was able to bring the first news to the United States of the St. Mihiel offensive. Hank Wales of INS gained journalistic fame for an exploit of his own. He was the most eloquent reporter of the execution of a Dutch dancer, Gertrud Margarete Zelle, and through it he helped create the twentieth-century legend of the femme fatale, Mata Hari, as she called herself when she was not selling military secrets to the Germans.¹⁴

In the final days of the war, the tension among journalists became almost unbearable. Each watched the other for a sign that the news for which the whole world hungered, the end of the world war might be close.

¹²Mott, American Journalism, p. 621.

¹³Charles A. Fenton, The Apprenticeship of Ernest Hemingway: The Early Years, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, Inc., 1954), p. 89.

¹⁴INS Report, October 19, 1917.

It was before noon on November 7, 1918, when a message from Paris under the name of Roy W. Howard, president of the United Press, gave the UP this triumphant lead:

"Paris, Nov. (UP)--The war is over. Germany and the Allies signed an armistice at 11 a.m. today, hostilities ceasing three hours later. As Marshal Foch's terms are known to include provisions which will prevent resumption of hostilities, the greatest war of all time has come to an end."¹⁵

The news touched off a rozzing, jubilant, unrestrained celebration throughout the United States. Normally there should have been "follow stories" from Paris and London. The disturbing fears were perhaps greater in the UP offices than anywhere else: they had just handled the greatest exclusive beat of modern history, but the ensuing silence was appalling. The beat was "too damned exclusive."

At 2:15 p.m. on that maddening day, the AP finally put out this bulletin:

"Washington, Nov. 7 (AP)--It was officially announced at the State Department at 2:15 o'clock this afternoon that the Germans had not signed armistice terms."¹⁶

Howard had received the false report at Brest from Admiral Henry B. Wilson, commander of all the United States' naval forces in France, with full assurance that it was official and authoritative. He even sent his secretary with the UP president to the cable office, where the censors' room was empty, for everyone had gone into the streets to celebrate, to help him get it

¹⁵Joe Alex Morris, Deadline Every Minute; the Story of the United Press, (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1957), pp. 99-101.

¹⁶Gramling, Story of News, p. 281.

through. Under such circumstances, apparently, the message had passed censorship.

Two hours later, Wilson informed Howard that the news was unconfirmed and the second message was dispatched; but now censors were really on the job and that cablegram was delayed. The UP rode with Howard's bulletin to a journalistic disaster. This incident apparently became "one of the greatest hoaxes of newspaper history."¹⁷ Thus, the wartime challenge to the independent press to choose between freedom and security was, for all practical purposes, left unsolved.

When the actual armistice was signed on November 11, celebrations were more fully organized; but something of the edge had been taken off the jubilation by the more spontaneous activities of four days earlier.

The censorship of the war correspondence was as unfamiliar as it was unwelcome. "It has long been a grave question," said Abraham Lincoln during the American Civil War, "whether any Government not too strong for the liberties of its people can be strong enough to maintain its existence in great emergencies." The World War of 1914-1918 brought this question to the supreme test.

American correspondents who gathered in London to report the European war discovered immediately that it was impossible to carry on their work without depending on the government for which they operated. It is true, war censorship was an

¹⁷The New York Tribune, Nov. 8, 1918, editorial page.

established tradition in the world; independent reporting of international crisis was an ideal or mirage.

American war correspondents who remained in London, or elsewhere in the Continent, criticized bitterly the restrictions which prevented them ^Prom proceeding with their plans. They could pass along only second-hand news. This news suppression resulted in the American press's comments on the irksome censorship.

Shortly after the entrance of America into the war, President Wilson appointed a Committee on Public Information,¹⁸ the purposes of which were twofold:

- 1) To be a clearing-house for the news of the various departments at Washington;
- 2) To act as censors for war intelligence received from other sources.

The committee consisted of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and one civilian, George Creel, as chairman. The committee was charged not only with administering a voluntary censorship on information of value to the enemy, but also with conducting an information campaign about the war in the United States and abroad.

It was the patriotic desire of the newspapers to support their government and its policies in time of war that gave the committee on Public Information its power to introduce the Espionage Act of June 15, 1917, the Trading with the Enemy Act

¹⁸Robert W. Jones, Journalism in the United States, (New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, Inc., 1947), pp. 594-7.

of October 6, 1917, and the amendment to the Espionage Act, known as the Sedition Act of May 16, 1918, to the public.¹⁹

In a statement of Creel's defense, he said that his Committee "at no point did it seek or exercise authority under these war laws that limited the freedom of speech and press."²⁰

Newspaper men's journals showed interest in the annual report of Major-General Hugh S. Scott, Chief of Staff of the United States army, in which he discussed plans for censorship in time of war. He urged that "in time of national peril the President should at once direct a censorship of all communications by mail, cable, wire, or wireless."²¹

A pamphlet issued by the United States Army War College calling for strict censorship in time of emergency if the press was "to serve its purpose,"²² proposed to put vast powers of censorship in the hands of the Postmaster General.²³ The establishment of censorship over War Department news,²⁴ was likewise subject of comment.

After the coming of the AEF, with American participation in the formulation of censorship procedure, conditions were notably better for newspapermen. General Pershing had chosen Frederick

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 599-601.

²⁰Mott, American Journalism, pp. 625-7.

²¹Editor & Publisher, 48(January 8, 1916), p. 871.

²²Ibid., 48(April 8, 1916), p. 1343.

²³Fourth Estate, 1164(June 17, 1916), p. 14.

²⁴Editor & Publisher, 49(July 8, 1916), p. 6.

Palmer, who gave up an estimated \$40,000 a year and a new job as the New York Herald correspondent at the front to become a lowly public relations major at \$175 a month, as the chief American censor, to handle censorship matters.²⁵ Palmer wrote the section of the U.S. Field Service Regulations dealing with war correspondents.²⁶ Newspaper workers recognized the need for military restriction of public information; and though there were many complaints at first, most correspondents came to agree that the AEF censorship was, on the whole, sensibly conducted.

Despite censorship at home and abroad and the difficulties placed in the way of war correspondents by all the European military authorities, the American people were better informed concerning the progress of the war than were those of any other country in the world.

A war, especially the First World War, is an important assignment for American war correspondents. They are given carte blanche by their editors, to go where they please and spend what they please. It is comparatively easy for them to go anywhere, except to the front.

A war correspondent is mainly an historian who sees a small cross-section of the conflict which is valuable as a piece of history to be put together after the war with the contributions of others beginning to learn that fact and to understand that a war is much like other assignments. They are coming to depend

²⁵Hohenberg, Foreign Correspondence, p. 235.

²⁶Mott, American Journalism, p. 622.

more and more on members of their regular staffs, in other words, on everyday straight-ahead good out-and-out newspaper men. The successful newspaper war correspondent must have good news sense, physical endurance, and organizing ability.

When the news came that Europe was going to war again, the clan of men who had written about wars began to gather from the ends of the earth. They went to the front to inspire the soldiers and to record their deeds of heroism for their readers.

CHAPTER V

COVERAGE OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The war reporting of World War II became as different from war reporting during World War I as war correspondence in general during the first conflict had been different from war correspondence of previous periods.

World War II brought perhaps not as many glamorous stories and certainly not as many scoops on the part of a few shrewd and fortunate lone wolf correspondents. There is, however, a general coverage which gives the reader a fairly accurate idea of how the war was progressing. This coverage was obtained by a great number of newspapermen who were assigned to the capitals and frontlines of the countries at war, and whose job was not merely collecting handouts but involved ^{or sifting} sieving them, establishing some kind of order and relation between important and unimportant news.

The decisive difference, however, between war correspondents of World War I and World War II lay in the fact that the later war was a total war. The war had fronts at home as well as abroad. That situation meant that the war correspondents no longer had only to entertain, they had mostly to inform. And they had to inform people who felt themselves part of the struggle. War correspondents had become intelligence officers who

communicated news from one part of the front to another.

For the American war correspondent, the war did not start with Pearl Harbor. Many were reporting on the war long before: in Ethiopia, in Spain, in Norway, Belgium, France, England, the Balkans, Russia, and China. They showed their readers the changing world.

John Whitaker wrote about the little Italian soldier in Ethiopia who did not know whether he should fight or not. Mussolini had told him to fight. His priest had told him that war was evil.

Maurice Hindus told his readers about the people in Prague after Munich. Almost every day new maps would be exhibited in shop windows showing the shrinking frontiers of Czechoslovakia. They could not understand what had happened to their country. Why was it steadily growing smaller and smaller?

Louis Fischer told about a scene in an English railway station. There were a man and his son. The father had been in the First World War, the son was now in the Royal Air Force. The father spoke about his experience in 1917 in France. "It was sad to think that the generation which fought the 'war to end wars' and then fathered sons and daughters to live in peace was now fighting a second world war in company with those sons and daughters."

Leland Stowe told his readers how the people in Oslo reacted when a few hundred Germans marched in and took over. They just

looked on, incapable of understanding what was going on. What should they do?

Louis Lochner told his readers about the prominent Jewish businessman who had proved himself a better patriot in many respects than most of his Aryan contemporaries, and who, after Hitler came to power, was sitting in his office waiting to die. "And now they say I am not a German," he kept repeating pathetically, "I just cannot understand."

After the Pact of Munich was signed, the storm broke, the inevitable happened, and everything was involved in war. American war correspondents gave their readers accounts of the atrocities against Jews in Vienna, the terrorist activities against Czech students in Prague, the extermination of the Polish population, the bombing of Rotterdam and the strafing of fleeing civilians with machine guns.

American war correspondents gave first hand reports of the Royal Air Force battling the Luftwaffe over the Dunkerque beaches while a remnant of the French army held off the Germans, thus permitting 330,000 British troops to be saved. They described what was "the most extensive and difficult combined operation in naval history."

The reporting of the Battle of Britain by the talented American war correspondents was incalculable. The most influential war correspondent was Edward R. Murrow of the Columbia Broadcasting System. Night after night he began his broadcasts with a sepulchral, "This....is London."

"If the purpose of the bombings was to strike terror into the hearts of the Britishers," he reported on the climactic night of September 15, 1940, to his American listeners, "then the bombs have been wasted."¹

Another who had wide influence in the United States was Quentin Reynolds of Collier's. In his magazine articles, radio talks, books, and a movie he brought back to the United States with him, he sounded the constant theme, "London can take it."² And he was right.

Among those who carried the heaviest responsibility was the New York Times bureau chief, Raymond Daniell, whom a friend described as "a man utterly without fear." On many a night, as he did on September 8, 1940, near the climax of the air war over London, he drove for miles through the bombed city to see for himself what damage the Nazis had done. Of the British, he wrote, "they are living through hell and behaving like angels."³

There were many, many more active war correspondents in London during the Battle of Britain. Among them were Drew Middleton, William McGaffin, and Robert Bunnelle in the AP office; Wallace Carroll of the UP; Robert J. Casey and William H. Stoneman of the Chicago Daily News. They served to generate an atmosphere in which President Roosevelt could arrange with Churchill for the destroyers-for-bases deal, for lend-lease, and

¹Columbia Broadcasting System Monthly Report, September, 1940.

²Collier's, September, 1940, p. 65.

³New York Times, September 8, 1940, p. 8.

for the close cooperation that made continued British resistance stronger.

These correspondents were involved in a total European war and served in a new role to such reporters before the United States became actively involved.

On Sunday, December 7, 1941, the Japanese carried out their fateful decision to attack Pearl Harbor without any warning. The United States promptly declared war on the Axis. This was now a global war.

The newspapers of the United States in this new war situation were busy with every sort of war drive, from war bonds to scrap iron, but their principal preoccupation was carrying the news, which was written by their correspondents of a vast conflict which stretched from the Aleutians to New Guinea, from Norway to all the borders of Europe, Africa, Asia, and Australia, as well as over the seven seas. The front pages unfolded the story day by day, carrying many thousands of words of on-the-spot reporting. Those reports became the big news stories of the generation.⁴ War news came first.

During this period, American war correspondents had gathered the most reliable information and transmitted it rapidly. They enjoyed enormous prestige with their colleagues as well as with the general public abroad. They were considered the best, the most honest, and the fastest in the world. They were assigned

⁴"War Correspondents," Time, 44(August 7, 1944), p. 64.

to the theaters of wars in the Pacific, to trips in Flying Fortresses and the PT boats and aircraft carriers, to commando and task force raids, to wanderings through the jungle and the desert. Their reporting was the greatest achievement of the American press in all its history.

The best stories about World War II did not come out of army headquarters, War correspondents had to go to the field to report dramatic events. It could not have been otherwise. The war was a massive thing. It was fought on all fronts. New devices were used to kill, and finally the atomic bomb was used. Battles were fought at times when opposing forces could not even see each others.

One man could write all that Americans wanted to read about the Boer War,⁵ for example, or the Russo-Japanese War,⁶ which were far away, with Americans not involved. However, 435 American war correspondents were assigned to write and photograph World War II on its various fronts.⁷ No one had to encroach upon what another witnessed. It was just that big an affray with its Atlantic, African, Eurasian, and Pacific theaters of military, air, and naval conflicts. Never before had the people of any nation been served by a comparable army of newsmen abroad.⁸

⁵ Richard Harding Davis was active in the Boer War.

⁶ No American War correspondent was in the Russo-Japanese War.

⁷ Mott, American Journalism, p. 742.

⁸ Walter E. Schneider, "U. S. War Staffs on All Fronts Face Toughest Job in 4th Year--Coverage Problems and Risks in

War correspondents who wrote the news and photographed the scenes of that global war hailed from all parts of the United States. Not only were they crack cameramen and experienced reporters who were able writers, but they had the youth and vigor to sustain themselves in whatever area they were. Noncombatants and, therefore, unarmed and defenseless, they suffered hardships, were taken prisoner and met death with fortitude equal to that of the bravest of the armed and armored troops whose deeds they were reporting in pictures and words.

Elmer Davis, director of the Office of War Information once paid tribute to the 435 American war correspondents who were assigned to cover every corner of the front for the frank and complete war story they had given the American people. He says:

"The gallantry of war correspondents and photographers is akin to that of our fighting men, but it is also a thing apart. For they do not fight--and they cannot fight back when, as happens so often, their own lives are jeopardized.... Their service is one to which we owe much; to which we will owe even more."⁹

The reporting of the invasion on Normandy was the "wildest and best news coverage of any military operation in all history," according to Elmer Davis, chief of the Office of War Information.

Global Conflict," Editor & Publisher, 37(September 12, 1942), pp. 5-6, Walter E. Schneider, "War Staffs Abroad at New Peak for 2nd Year of U.S. Offensive-Reporters Total 370, Photographers 65, 50 Press Groups Have Men Overseas," Editor & Publisher, 16 (April 17, 1943), p. 19, and Virgil Pinkley, "Correspondent Corps Is Set for Invasion Coverage--500 Reporters Expected," Editor & Publisher 22(May 27, 1944), p. 5.

⁹"War Correspondents," Newsweek, 17(April 26, 1943), p. 20.

There were 237 American newspapermen, including 214 writers and 23 photographers assigned to cover the invasion.¹⁰ Among them, press association representatives numbered 72, Army publications 37, American newspaper special correspondents 56, magazines 34, and radio 19.

Of the hand-picked invasion corps, half (about 169) were at the headquarters of General Dwight Eisenhower. Others were detailed to accompany the first landing forces of the invasion. A radio transmitter was immediately erected and used for communication not only across the channel but across the Atlantic.¹¹ The flow of pooled information began at once, and increased hour by hour.

Correspondents were active when the invasion began. Walter Cronkite, of the UP, flew in over the invasion coast at dawn, one of several reporters in a B-17 bomber group. Another UP man, Collie Small, flew with the Ninth Air Force. Don Whitehead hit the beach on D-Day with the troops, going in under heavy enemy fire. Jack Thompson of the Chicago Tribune was in soon afterward. Roelif Loveland of the Cleveland Plain Dealer wrote: "We saw the curtain go up this morning on the greatest drama in the history of the world, the invasion of Hitler's Europe."¹² And George Hicks of ABC stood on the U.S.S. Ancon as a network pool reporter

¹⁰Jones, Journalism in the United States, p. 642.

¹¹Philip Schuyler, "U. S. Press Well Prepared, Covers Invasion in Stride," Editor & Publisher, 24(June 10, 1944), p. 9.

¹²Ibid., p. 10.

and gave a superb description of the panorama of D-Day on the Normandy shore.¹³

The nature of the war correspondent is such that he will take incredible chances, at times, to get a story. Every war correspondent in France wanted to be in on the capture of Paris. Larry Lesueur, a CBS war correspondent with extensive service in Russia and the Middle East, broadcast from Radio Paris before the French troops entered the city. He was the first one to give this news to the entire world.

Ernie Pyle, riding into Paris with Hank Gorrell of the UP in a jeep wrote of the hysterically joyful Parisian crowds: "We all got kissed until we were literally red in the face, and I must say we enjoyed it...The fact that I had not shaved for days and was gray-bearded as well as bald-headed, made no difference."¹⁴

Mark Watson of the Baltimore Sun who covered the entry of General Charles de Gaulle into Paris on August 26, 1944, amid sniper fire at the Hotel de Ville, wrote one of the fine and colorful stories of the war. He won a Pulitzer Prize for this article.

Some of the finest correspondence in these latter stages of the war in Europe came from the relatively small staff of the Christian Science Monitor, whose men ranged over the European battlefields. Probably the most active was Ronald Maillard

¹³Meyer Berger, The Story of the New York Times, (New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1951), pp. 481-2.

¹⁴Lee G. Miller, The Story of Ernie Pyle, (New York: The Viking Press, Inc., 1950), p. 361.

Stead, who observed the fighting in North Africa, at the Anzio beachhead, and went into Germany with the U.S. Ninth Army, finally being rowed across the Elbe by two Russians in a racing shell. Their business, as the Monitor stated it, was "to keep the long-range meaning in view and to write about it." These assignments were not easy to carry out, either for the Monitor men or anybody else.¹⁵

When the Allied victory was nearing, there was turmoil and heartache and grief. On April 12, 1945, when President Roosevelt died at Warm Springs, Ga., there was such a universal outpouring of grief. The first word to the United States was an INS flash, read over CBS by John Daly. Then in rapid succession came the BBC, in London and in Paris. Charles Collingwood of CBS truly said it best in his Paris broadcast, "It is as though a light went out."

Once again, as in World War I, there was trouble over the announcement of the end of the war in Europe. The German surrender came at 2:41 a.m. Monday, May 7, 1945, in General Eisenhower's Reims headquarters. At 2:00 p.m. the same day, the Germans used the Flensburg, Denmark, radio to broadcast a cease-fire order to their troops. At 3:24 p.m., Edward Kennedy, the chief AP correspondent at Eisenhower's headquarters, phoned his bulletin from Paris to London over regular military lines.

¹⁵Erwin D. Canham, Commitment to Freedom; the Story of the Christian Science Monitor, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958), pp. 286-322.

"Reims, France, May 7 - Germany surrendered unconditionally to the Western Allies and the Soviet Union at 2:41 a.m. today."¹⁶

The AP in New York, after eight minutes delay, flashed it around the world. It was a monumental beat for Kennedy, but it cost him his job. Fifty-three correspondents in Paris charged him with having committed "the most disgraceful, deliberate, and unethical doublecross in the history of journalism."¹⁷

General Eisenhower, in a statement issued through General Frank A. Allen, SHAEF's press relations chief, said Kennedy's beat had "endangered the surrender negotiations and the lives of soldiers."¹⁸

The New York Times, after printing Kennedy's story, denounced him for a "grave disservice" to his profession. Robert McLean, president of the AP, said in a prepared statement on Thursday after the AP beat: "The Associated Press profoundly regrets the distribution of this unauthorized dispatch."¹⁹

When official confirmation finally came, it was an anticlimax. The news was already known to everyone.

Judgment on Kennedy was adverse among newspapermen. To violate a release date is unethical, they pointed out. Kennedy's

¹⁶Dwight Bental, "War Climax Gives Press Its Biggest News Week," Editor & Publisher, 29(May 12, 1945), p. 7.

¹⁷"Kennedy V-E Beat Stirs Three-Point Controversy," Editor & Publisher, 20(May 12, 1945), p. 10.

¹⁸Mott, American Journalism, pp. 757-8, and Morris, Deadline Every Minute, pp. 287-90.

¹⁹Associated Press File, May 11-12, 1945.

supporters said the story was substantiated by a German broadcast which was common knowledge, and that Kennedy acted in the interest of the American public.

Kennedy himself declared that it was not military but political censorship which he had encountered and that the American newspaper readers had a right to know the facts, in spite of arbitrary censors.

At any rate, the Associated Press was first with the news on the Nazi surrender.

The War in the Pacific was being reported with gallantry and devotion by a group of war correspondents. American forces in the Pacific were engaged in their long and difficult campaign of island-hopping. The public at home could understand this campaign of desperate landings, resistance to the death by the defending Japanese, tales of great heroism and a steady and measurable progress in the Pacific that could be shown on maps with arrows, supplemented by the glowing superlatives of the correspondents who covered these events and lived through them. Battles won, battles lost, that was the news. Nothing else reported on page one or in the broadcasts that reached the ears of the American public seemed to matter.

On the morning of October 20, 1944, William B. Dickinson of the AP waded ashore with General MacArthur on the island of Leyte in the Philippines and recorded the General's first dramatic words: "I have returned." In the following months, one by one the Japanese island strongholds fell, and the American

bombers moved their bases ever closer to the Japanese home islands.

It was on August 6, 1945, that President Truman made his announcement that the United States had dropped the first atom bomb on Japan. There were no American war correspondents on this mission for first-hand and eye-witness reports.

On August 8, William H. Laurence, scientific reporter for the New York Times was summoned to fly with the second atomic bombing mission the next morning as the official reporter. At 3:50 a.m., August 9, when the B-29, the Great Artiste, took off from Tirriam, an island in the Pacific, the lone correspondent could see for himself how an atomic bomber looked on its way to wipe out a city. He flew in one of the two B-29's that accompanied the Great Artiste which carried the second atomic bomb.

When the airplane arrived over Nagasaki, the destination, at 12:01 p.m., he wrote:

"We heard the pre-arranged signal on our radio, put on our arc welder's glasses, and watched tensely the maneuverings of the strike ship about a half mile in front of us.

"There

"There she goes, someone said.

"Out of the belly of the Great Artiste what looked like a black object went downward---A giant flash broke through the dark barrier of our arc welder's lenses and flooded our cabin with intense light.

"A tremendous blast wave struck our ship and made it tremble from nose to tail. This was followed by four more blasts in rapid succession, each resounding like the boom of cannon fire hitting one plane from all directions.

"Observers in the tail of our ship saw a giant ball of fire rise as though from the bowels of the earth, belching forth enormous white smoke rings. Next they saw a giant pillar of purple fire, ten thousand feet high shooting skyward with enormous speed---

"Only about forty-five seconds had passed. Awestruck, we watched it shoot upward like a meteor coming from the earth instead of from outer space, becoming ever more alive as it climbed skyward through the white clouds---

"Now, just as it appeared as though the thing had settled down into a state of permanence, there came shooting out of the top a giant mushroom that increased the height of the pillar to a total of 45,000 feet---

"We landed in Okinawa in the afternoon, our tanks nearly empty, and there, to our great relief, was No. 77 (The Great Artiste)--- While we were refueling we learned that the Soviet Union had entered the war against Japan."²⁰

That report earned Bill Laurence his second Pulitzer Prize. It also made him the first, and for at least the succeeding generation, the only correspondent to witness an atomic strike in wartime. He was thereafter to be known as "Atomic Bill."²¹

On August 10, Japan announced acceptance of the terms of the Potsdam Declaration with a reservation that insured the continued reign of the emperor. On August 12, at 9:33 p.m., the New York office of the UP flashed a false report of the Japanese surrender, but killed it three minutes later. Subsequently, the UP offered a reward of \$5,000 for the conviction of the author of the hoax, but nobody ever collected the

²⁰Berger, New York Times, pp. 510-23.

²¹Ibid., p. 523.

money.²² Finally, Emperor Hirohito on August 15 announced the acceptance of unconditional surrender. President Truman named General MacArthur to receive the formal surrender.

On September 2, aboard the U. S. Missouri in Tokyo Bay, more than 200 Allied correspondents and four Japanese correspondents covered the formal surrender by the Japanese. Homer Bigart, of the New York Herald Tribune, wrote an imaginative story on the signing of Japan's surrender which won for him the Pulitzer Prize for international reporting.²³ His article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on September 3, 1945:

"ABOARD U.S.S. MISSOURI, TOKYO BAY, September 2 -- Japan, paying for her desperate throw of the dice at Pearl Harbor, passed from the ranks of the major powers at 9:05 a.m. today when Foreign Minister Mamoru Shigemitsu signed the document of unconditional surrender.

"If the memories of the bestialities of the Japanese prison camps were not so fresh in mind, one might have felt sorry for Shigemitsu as he hobbled on his wooden leg toward the green baize-covered table where the papers lay waiting.

"He leaned heavily on his cane and had difficulty seating himself. The cane, which he rested against the table, dropped to the deck of the battleship as he signed.

"No word passed between him and General Douglas MacArthur who motioned curtly to the table when he had finished his opening remarks.

"Lieutenant-General Jonathan M. Wainwright, who surrendered at Corregidor, haggard from his long imprisonment, and Lieutenant-General A. E. Percival,

²²Jones, Journalism in the United States, pp. 646-7, and Mott, American Journalism, p. 759.

²³Bryce W. Rucker, Twentieth Century Reporting at Its Best, (Ames, Iowa: University of Iowa Press, 1964), pp. 122-4.

who surrendered at Singapore on another black day of the war, stood at MacArthur's side as the Allied Supreme Commander signed for all the powers war-ring against Japan.

"Their presence was a sobering reminder of how desperately close to defeat our nation had fallen during the early months of 1942.

"The Japanese delegation of eleven looked appropriately trim and sad. Shigemitsu was wearing mourning clothes--frock coat, striped pants, silk hat, and yellow gloves. None of the party exchanged a single word of salute while on board, except the foreign minister's aid, who had to be shown where to place the Japanese texts of the surrender document.

"Shigemitsu, however, doffed his silk hat as he reached the top of the starboard gangway and stepped aboard the broad deck of the Missouri."

Out of the seventy million who fought in World War II, with an estimated death toll of seventeen million who died in battle and eighteen million civilians who were killed in other ways, the total number of war correspondents on all sides could not have amounted to much more than a brigade. The United States, by all odds, had the largest number of working journalists at the war fronts, with 1,646 accredited correspondents in service, of whom 37 were killed and 112 wounded.

Many gave their lives even before Pearl Harbor. There was Webb Miller, head of the United Press in Europe, who was killed in a blackout in London and was the first American newsman killed overseas.²⁴

There was Ralph W. Barnes. He met his death when he took part in an RAF raid during the Greek-Italian campaign. Almost

²⁴Morris, Deadline Every Minute, pp. 226-7.

identical was the fate of Robert Post of the New York Times, who took part in a bomber raid over Bremen and never returned.²⁵

There was Ben Robertson, who was killed in a clipper near Lisbon, and Melville Jacoby, who died in an equally senseless way in a plane accident over Australia after escaping the dangers of Bataan.

There was Jack Singer of the International News Service, who met his death aboard the aircraft Wasp.

Then there was Byron Darnton of the New York Times, who was killed in New Guinea. In his last dispatch, printed on the day his obituary appeared, he wrote:

"The correspondent in this war, unlike his predecessor of 25 years ago, can find manifold evidence that victory will be well used....Young men who are doing our fighting are, to a surprising extent, thinking about the war's end. Not only in terms of getting away from danger and discomfort. They are thinking also in terms of what kind of world we shall have after peace comes. They are thinking realistically....The politician who preaches 'normalcy' at the end of this war will find some hardheaded opposition.

"From the high hill near the airdome a man can see his countrymen building with blood, sweat, and toil the firm resolution that their sons shall have peace, because they will know how to preserve peace....It is stirring to see this change in attitude. It makes the dust all right, the flies all right, the heat all right."²⁶

This was the last story of Byron Darnton.

Perhaps among the best known writers who perished were Raymond Clapper and Ernie Pyle. Clapper was famous as a

²⁵Berger, New York Times, pp. 460-1.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 462-3.

commentator-columnist who went out of his way to cover parts of the Pacific Theater of War, and particularly the great assault on the Japanese occupied Marshalls. He died in a plane crash.

Pyle was a front-line correspondent who went into battle areas after news, as indeed, did scores of others. Pyle was especially beloved by readers at home and G.I.'s in the theaters of war for his simple, direct reporting on life and happenings at the front. In 1944 he received the Pulitzer Prize for reporting. William Howard Russell, the great Britisher, proudly called himself the first war correspondent. The mild and self-enfacing Ernie Pyle wanted to be the last.²⁷

Major General Lewis H. Brereton said it as he handed over the air medal to Hand Correll, correspondent for the United Press:

"His actions have been typical of the work of a free man fighting for a free world. On occasions like this, democracy has good reason to be proud of itself."

A free press fighting for a free world. That is what American war correspondents have brought about--as other Allied soldiers, and long before the others. Knowing for what they fight, and thus fighting and dying so that the free men should know.

It may be taken for granted that the world tended to see the war most frequently in the terms presented by the American wire service, namely, the Associated Press, the United Press, and the International News Service. As for the newspaper correspondents, those who worked for powerful individual newspapers,

²⁷Miller, Ernie Pyle, pp. 424-7.

newspaper groups, or radio organizations exerted a greater effect on public opinion than did their followers. Finally, there were a few journalists of outstanding talent who stood far above the rank and file--Ernie Pyle, Homer Bigart, William L. Lawrence, Alen Moorhead, Edward R. Murrow, Ilya Ehienburg, Each in his own way was more important to his own country than an army when home front morale was sagging and all seemed lost.

Camera reporters played a far larger part than ever before in the reporting of World War II. Photographers "shot it out" on all fronts. Picture pages were to add to the reader's knowledge. Their photos memorably recorded tragic scenes in permanent form. Some of them inspired patriotism, for example, the AP photographer Joe Rosenthal's photo of the Marines raising the American flag on Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima was the famous picture of the war.²⁸ For it, Rosenthal was given a Pulitzer Prize. His touching picture was used for war posters, and was reproduced in an issue of postage stamps.

Many women acted as war correspondents. Inez Robb of INS and Ruth E. Cowan, of AP, accompanied the first WAAC corps to go overseas, and they reported the news in North Africa in 1943. There were more than twenty-one women correspondents who covered the invasion story on June 6, 1944.²⁹ Peggy Hall was in the Pacific area in 1944 to cover marine activities for the Cleveland Plain Dealer and the American Newspaper Alliance. The first

²⁸Cooper, The Associated Press, pp. 238-40.

²⁹Mott, American Journalism, p. 743.

woman correspondent who accompanied the bombing mission in January, 1943, during the Tunisian Campaign was Time and Life's photographer, Margaret Bourke-White. There was a PM's woman correspondent, Leah Burdette, who was slain by bandits in Iran in 1942. The year before her death, she had been expelled from Bucharest because of anti-fascist sympathies.

The Combat Correspondents of the Marine Corps used a new technique. These young reporters, trained as fighter-writers, first hit the front pages with the story of the fighting in the Solomon Islands in August, 1942. Perhaps their most remarkable showing was made in connection with the landing at Tarawa, when thirty-five combat writers and photographers covered the action and two cameramen were killed. Sergeant Jim G. Lucas, formerly of Tulsa, Oklahoma, Tribune, wrote an initial eye-witness story of that action which was carried in full by nearly every daily newspaper in the United States, and was widely praised as a war correspondent of the first order.³⁰

For the first time, radio news of war was all important. Hour-by-hour reports from correspondents all over the globe were available to the public through the network. The radio men covered every angle of the war and played a leading role in the invasion forces in North Africa, Italy, Normandy, and the Pacific theaters. The network has spent a million dollars to cover the V-E Day and V-J Day for special victory programs. This was a

³⁰Jones, Journalism in the United States, pp. 649-53, and Mott, American Journalism, pp. 746-50.

brilliant chapter for radio journalism.

American censorship in World War II began before the war itself. The first step was taken December 31, 1940, when Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox broadcast what he called a confidential letter to 5,000 newspaper, radio, and picture editors, asking avoidance of practically all navy news except recruiting, unless it was officially announced.

Censorship of press and radio was put into effect December 19, 1941, twelve days after Pearl Harbor.³¹ On that day, President Roosevelt, acting under the first War Powers Act, established an Office of Censorship and appointed a director. The man picked was Byron Price, executive news editor of the United Press. He accepted upon condition that he was not to be called upon to send out propaganda. President Roosevelt was in accord with his attitude. It was an excellent choice, for both press and radio knew him as one of themselves, and had full confidence in him. There were, furthermore, reassured by the tone of the President's announcement, which began:

"All Americans abhor censorship, just as they abhor war. But the experience of this and all other nations has demonstrated that some degree of censorship is essential in war time, and we are at war.

"The important thing is that such forms of censorship as are necessary shall be administered effectively and in harmony with the best interests of our free institutions."³²

³¹Harold L. Cross, Freedom of Information, Censorship: Soldier vs. Fourth Estate, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 179.

³²Ibid., p. 179.

The only function of censorship in time of war, Price declared, is to save lives. Military information and facts which, if published, might guide enemy attack, were suppressed.

The wartime codes of practice for radio broadcasters were issued January 15, 1942, by the Office of Censorship. These codes had no statutory sanction, nor was there any legal penalty which could be imposed upon violators. They represented "a system of self-discipline under the leadership of the government."

A revised press censorship code was issued June 25, 1942, after five months of experience with the problem.

A new clause on "Attacks by Air" included advice given by Director Byron Price on a statement to publishers. Another was entitled "Notes on Rumors." "The spread of rumors in such a way that they will be accepted as facts will render aid and comfort to the enemy. The same is true of enemy propaganda or material calculated by the enemy to bring about division among the United Nations."

The War Department in February, 1942, drafted regulations covering the work of war correspondents and established their status in the various theaters of war operations.

The preamble of the rules recognized that correspondents perform "an undoubted public function in the dissemination of news concerning the operations of the army in time of war," but added this admonition:

"Correspondents accompanying troops in the field occupy a dual and delicate position, being under the necessity of truthfully disclosing to the people the facts concerning the operations of the Army, and at

the same time of refraining from disclosing those things which, though true, would be disastrous to us if known to the enemy."³³

Accuracy was demanded first of all. The regulation said:

"A correspondent will be suspended from all privileges for the distortion of his dispatches in the office of publication which he represents and also for the use of words or expressions conveying a hidden meaning which would tend to mislead or deceive the censor and cause the approval by him of otherwise objectionable dispatches."³⁴

³³Jones, Journalism in the United States, pp. 602-15.

³⁴Ibid.

CHAPTER VI

COVERAGE OF THE KOREAN WAR

Less than five years after the Japanese surrender American soldiers were killing and being killed in the Korean "police action." Not one United States newsman was in Korea when hostilities broke out. So with the build-up of arms came the amassing of war correspondents. Marguerite Higgins established herself during the war; and such veterans as Keyes Beech, Chicago Daily News; Jack MacBeth, Associated Press; and Gene Symonds, United Press, resumed their war correspondence roles.

In Korea, the going was almost as rough for war correspondents as it was for soldiers. American war correspondents then in Korea had had their own tough job to do since the end of World War II. Most of them took their chances with the troops, ate and slept where they could, were soon covered with mosquito and flea bites and came down with dysentery.

In the early period of the war, war correspondents faced inadequate communications. News was easy to find, but hard to get out. In the 24th Division headquarters at Taejon, there was only one military line to Tokyo over which the correspondents could phone messages. They had to stand in line, were rationed a few minutes each, and dictated bulletins or details.

This bad situation had been improved by August, 1950, Telephone and teletype lines, in some cases, had been extended down to division headquarters. On good days, Korean copy reached Tokyo anywhere from one to six hours after it had been filed. The flood of interviews with combat weary G.I.'s, which had brought down the wrath of General MacArthur, had largely dried up. The cables now gave a clearer, more matter-of-fact picture of the kind of guerrilla war the UN troops were fighting and how they were reluctantly learning the inhuman was in which they had to fight it.

There was no place to hide in Korea. Ray Richards of INS, who wrote his first story of the war on June 28, was killed in action July 9. Five other American newsmen and photographers were also killed that month. Burton Crane of the New York Times and Frank Sibney of Time, Inc., were injured in the blow up of the Han River bridges outside Seoul during the first day of the retreat. Ernie Peeler of the Stars and Stripes was also killed in the early few weeks after the war.

By September, 238 correspondents were accredited to Korea, but the best estimates were that fewer than a quarter of that number were ever at the front at one time. As for the hard day-to-day coverage, no more than a score stuck at it throughout the war.

Many World War II veteran correspondents came in early. Among them were AP's Don Whitehead, Relman Moriu, Robert Eunson, and Hal Boyle, who had distinguished themselves under fire. Homer

Bigart, the old pro from the New York Herald Tribune and little Bobby Vermillion of the UP, both of whom had survived World War II, also saw the worst of the Korean war. Then, there were former GI combat correspondents, the fiercest competitor being Jim Lucas of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. New men came in, among them William J. Jorden of the AP and later the New York Times; Dick Applegate of the UP, who would spend eighteen months in Communist prison camps, and an Asian specialist, Philip Potter of the Baltimore Sun.

Homer Bigart was with the fifth wave of Marines at Inchon on September 15, 1950, when MacArthur made his first offensive move, halting the retreat. Bigart filed his story of the Inchon landing in both Korea and Tokyo, hoping one or the other would be cleared by the censor. The Tokyo copy went through by mistake, the censor being under the impression that it had been approved in Korea, and Bigart had a world beat.

The correspondents went into recaptured Seoul and crossed the 38th Parallel with the troops when MacArthur gave the order. Because the North Koreans didn't seem to know much about the Geneva Convention and cared less, many correspondents began carrying weapons. Marguerite Higgins of the New York Herald Tribune wrote:

"Most correspondents carried arms of some kind. The enemy had no qualms about shooting unarmed civilians. And the fighting was so fluid that no place near the front lines was safe from sudden attack."¹

¹Marguerite Higgins, War in Korea--Report of a Woman Combat Correspondent, (New York: Harper & Row, 1953), pp. 130-1.

It was Marguerite Higgins who became the most discussed correspondent of the war. She insisted on taking as many risks as the bravest men. She was also a courageous competitor. Early in the war she was ordered back to Japan because, as General Walton H. Walker put it: "There are no facilities at the front for ladies."² Miss Higgins, who had been viewing the front from foxholes, violently objected. With the support of her newspaper she appealed to General MacArthur, who permitted her to remain. The result was a perpetual stream of anecdotes, some flattering, some unkind, and a keen professional rivalry with Bigart, whose superiority she would not acknowledge. The competition for top billing on the New York Herald Tribune's front page gave this newspaper honors for outstanding coverage in the war period.

On November 23, 1950, MacArthur alerted five wire service correspondents to fly with him to Korea. On the plane, he gave them a communique announcing the opening of his "end the war" offensive. Later that November 26 in Korea, MacArthur remarked to an aide, in the presence of the AP's Relman Morin and a few others, "you tell the boys that when they get to the Yalu, they are going home. I want to make good on my statement that they are going to eat Christmas dinner at home." However, on November 25, that year, Communist China sent 250,000 troops into the Korean War.

²"Pride of the Regiment," Time, 56(September 25, 1950), pp. 63-4.

A few of the correspondents at once hitched rides in C-47s that were being used to bring supplies to the besieged force and pick up the wounded. Keys Beech of the Chicago Daily News, who stayed three days with the 1st Marine Division, called it a "trial by blood and ice." The mercury was 15 degrees below zero in the hostile land. Beech wrote of that Marine blockade that served an army: "Whatever this campaign was--retreat, withdrawal or defeat--one thing can be said with certainty, not in the Marine Corps' long and bloody history has there been anything like it. And if you'll pardon a personal recollection, not at Tarawa or Iwo Jima, where casualties were much greater, did I see men suffer so much. The wonder isn't that they fought their way out against overwhelming odds but that they were able to survive the cold and fight at all."³

Marguerite Higgins, who also went in for a short time to see how the marines were doing, gave this graphic report: "It was a battle all the way. The front and wind, howling through the narrow pass, were almost as deadly as the enemy. Bumper to bumper, trucks, half-trucks, and full-dozerers slipped and scraped down the mountain. Half a dozen vehicles skidded and careened off the road. Mortars lobbed in and sometimes the convoy had to stop for hours while engineers filled in the holes....Most of the Marines were so numb and exhausted that they didn't even bother to take over the sporadic machine-gun and rifle fire. When someone was killed, they would wearily, matter-of-factly, pick up the

³Chicago Daily News, December 11, 1950, p. 2.

body and throw it in the nearest truck."⁴

The war seesawed across the 38th Parallel throughout the winter. George Barrett of the New York Times, talking with a sergeant who had just lost a leg on the second anniversary of the war, reported his stoical remark: "That's the way the ball bounces."⁵

As the war continued, it became more so; by June 13, 1951, the new Supreme Commander had forced the Communists back across the 28th Parallel which resulted in a truce talk by the Communists. On July 10 this talk began at Kawsong. The news front in Korea blazed up again. This time it was hope of peace, not news of war that drew the correspondents; and drew them in greater numbers than at any time since the hottest fighting.

Kawsong coverage, however, was discouraging.⁶ The trouble was that the correspondents were barred from the helicopter area by a barbed-wire fence and armed guards. There was no press camp, no food, and information was scarce. They could only cover secondhand news from Army brief sessions.

Coverage was set up for sixteen correspondents for the first trip to Kawsong and then canceled. The only press representation for the West in Kaesong was an enlisted Army photographer whose lasting impression was that a captain had driven him in a jeep.

⁴Higgins, War in Korea, pp. 195-6.

⁵Keyes Beech, Tokyo and Points East, (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1954), pp. 207-8.

⁶"Correspondents at Bay," Time, 58(July 23, 1951), p. 41, and "Kaesong Coverage," Newsweek, 38(July 30, 1951), p. 64.

On the second day of the main talks, however, the names of five civilian photographers were pulled from a hat, and the men were allowed to drive to Kaesong. Their impressions, pooled for a news story by the waiting correspondents, were of an armed Red Camp and camera-shy subjects. Reporters, irked at the Red propaganda barrage stressing the Red's role as "host," grew more insistent on seeing the set-up for themselves.

Western correspondents were kept out of Kaesong because Kaesong was a Communist-held city, and the Reds refused to let them in. Instead of telling the free world what was happening, correspondents in Korea were being told by their Tokyo offices what was going on; Tokyo was getting it from Communist broadcasts. The Reds were winning an important propaganda victory.

After their appeal failed to get them into Kaesong for coverage, they were ready to drop all attempts to go to Kaesong even though General Ridgway stood firm, even broadened his demands on the Reds. At last the Reds gave in to General Ridgway. Correspondents finally were granted permission to enter Kaesong. It was fairly easy to say that the correspondents' stubborn stand had led to an important victory for the United Nations.⁷

There was a journalistic epilogue to the long and weary conflict, which introduced so many difficult elements into the reporting of the war. Despite great efforts made by the best correspondents, they never were able to explain the war cogently

⁷"Correspondent at Bay," Time, 58(July 23, 1951), p. 41.

to the nation. After General Eisenhower's successful campaign for the Presidency in 1952, he made a six-day trip to the Korean battlefields in fulfillment of a pledge he had given during his drive for election. Don Whitehead of the AP, who wrote a masterful account of what he called "The Great Deception" on Eisenhower's trip,⁸ was given the second of the two Pulitzer Prizes that were awarded to him during the war.

The Korean war was officially ended in July 27, 1953, On that date General William K. Harrison, representing the United Nations, and General Nam Il of North Korea met in the so-called "peace pagoda" at Panmunjen to sign an official armistice. Only one American reporter was present--LeRoy Hansen of the United Press, who dictated over a field telephone a running story of the ceremonies for the information of all other correspondents.⁹

Just a few days after fighting began in Korea, General MacArthur had been authorized to impose military censorship on war correspondents there. The general preferred to let the correspondents decide for themselves what should and should not be reported. A correspondent could get a green, battle-shocked soldier to say anything, said MacArthur, but it was the correspondent's responsibility to achieve a "leavening balance." MacArthur's action did not solve the basic problem of reporting the Korean war. As long as there was only "voluntary censorship," and no security regulations, a correspondent might guess wrong on

⁸AP File, December 5, 1952.

⁹Morris, Deadline Every Minute, p. 328.

what he should report, and then he would be accused of giving aid and comfort to the enemy, and some reporters suffered unjustly. Tom Lambert of the AP and Peter Kalischer of the UP were barred from the front by MacArthur's press-relations officer. The reason was that "their stories had given aid and comfort to the enemy."¹⁰

Both press associations protested the ban on their men directly to MacArthur, and newsmen began to ask for some sort of rules of censorship. Lambert and Kalischer finally were permitted to go to the front by General MacArthur; however, he asked the press to continue self-censorship. Censorship, MacArthur propounded, is "a responsibility which (the press) may not effectively share...least of all (with) the military not trained in journalism and which should devote its entire energies to the conduct of military operations."¹¹ But most correspondents said that the military should set up an official list of taboos. The scent of scoops kept their consciences uneasy.

War correspondents were confused by this voluntary censorship. There was a continual and dangerous clash between conscience and competition as a voluntary censorship system went on.

General MacArthur's voluntary censorship policy also resulted in a protest which was drawn up by the Overseas Press Club in New York. They asked for an immediate imposition of a

¹⁰"Needed: A Rule Book," Time, 56(July 24, 1950), p. 58.

¹¹"This Ain't Good," Newsweek, 36(July 24, 1950), p. 47.

military security check on all copy from Korea so that all reporters could write by the same rules and military effort could not be compromised.

War correspondents got some fairly rigid guide posts to help keep their ethical practice in line by mid-August, 1950. Eighth Army headquarters in Korea set up seven official taboos for correspondents to observe in their reports: identification of newly arrived units before an Eighth Army go-ahead; naming of new general officers arriving on the scene before their assignments were announced officially; any mention of operation plans, mention of the position of troops being regrouped for battle; revelation of "friendly" casualties before issuance of official lists; any but "minimum" announcements of the commanding general's visits to battle areas; mention, by name, of persons missing in action prior to official release.

When the news of General Walton Walker's accidental death in Korea on December 23, 1950, leaked out prematurely, Eighth Army headquarters quickly tossed out its generally ignored "voluntary censorship" rule. Correspondents were being strictly censored eleven hours after the fatal accident. Furthermore, regulations were also issued that forbade correspondents to describe armament and equipment, to discuss the Army's "strength, efficiency, and morale, to identify troops by unit or location, or even to mention the presence of U.S. troops in any sector until the enemy knew it." Dispatches not only had to be "accurate in statement and implication"¹² but also written as not to "injure

the morale of our forces or our allies and---not to embarrass the U.S., its allies or neutral countries."

In the first few days of the new censorship, AP's Brines estimated the restrictions had cut his file from Korea by 25 percent and slowed up stories as much as an hour, but otherwise there had been no dire consequences.¹³

The problem of censorship was not just an headache in the U.S. The United Nations made it clear through Colonel Alfred G. Katzin, Secretary General Lie's personal representative in Korea. He said: "I feel it is necessary to make mention that, from the viewpoint of the United Nations forces---the tendency of some reporters to give publicity to information which can be of value to the enemy is most unfortunate---Thoughtlessness on this point on the part of some only of a great and dignified profession should not cause of life or injury to soldiers of the United Nations' forces."¹⁴

In the early December, 1952, the Defense Department announced its new regulation concerning "Field Press Censorship in Combat Areas" and straightway set about putting it into effect in Korea.

Censoring, formerly done by Intelligence, would now be a task for public relations officers. Key sections of the liberalized code state:

¹²"Throwing the Rule Book," Time, 57(January 22, 1951), p. 70-2.

¹³AP File, December 25-8, 1950.

¹⁴"Seven Times No," Newsweek, 36(August 28, 1950), p. 54.

1. "The importance of speed in the handling of news material is emphasized."
2. "Field press censorship is exercised for security only, and...news material will not be deleted or stopped on policy grounds."
3. The censor's "authority will not be used to prevent the transmission of news upon the ground of anticipated adverse reaction by the American public."¹⁵

¹⁵"Code for Korea," Newsweek, 40(December 22, 1952), p. 71.

CHAPTER VII

COVERAGE OF THE VIETNAM WAR

A decade after the Korean War, American war correspondents were assigned to Viet Nam to look for a controversial war. There are guerrillas, Communist-supported and Communist-trained, there are no front lines. The fighting can break out anywhere. And so the action has become, as General G. Wheeler said distastefully during an early phase of South Viet Nam's conflict, a "dirty little war."¹ Secretary of State Dean Rusk once called it a "dirty, untidy, and disagreeable" war.

Covering the Viet Nam war is difficult, because the war itself, is confusing and the most controversial in American history.

First, there is the fighting. There are no measuring rods that a correspondent can use to show who's winning and losing each day. No towns are captured, occupied, and put behind the lines. There are no large battles measured by the standards of every other war. Small units strike at the Viet Cong, who strike back from ambush. U.S. forces claim a victory, and the Viet Cong mortar attack the Saigon air base and blow up a hotel in the middle of town to dispute the claim.

¹Neil Sheehan, UPI File, Saigon, January 20, 1963.

Secondly, Viet Nam does not lend itself well to numerical reporting, or even to the kind of simple, narrative statement required of the average newspaper lead.

There are human elements in Viet Nam that can be described adequately in simple terms, because they are universal. But there are other elements so alien to American social patterns and thinking that they cannot be reported simply.

War reporting in itself, for example, is technically fairly simple. Reporting a single clash with X number of casualties is not unlike reporting a sports event. By an adroit use of verbs, the writer can create an impact that comes close to reproducing reality.

In Viet Nam, however, the actual clashes are probably less important than the subtle thinking of people and the social upheaval of the United States. These phenomena are difficult to capture in words, and for a reader to digest.

All of these imponderables leave huge gaps for claims of any kind by the South or North Vietnamese, by hawks or doves, by the government, or by those against the war.

Despite a daily expenditure of \$1,500,000 in American aid and the presence of more than 450,000 U.S. army troops and Marines, who are involved in the fighting, the Viet Nam story has been difficult to tell.

The American public at an earlier stage even seemed to ignore the fighting. As an American captain told a correspondent once while they watched Vietnamese troops plunging through

flooded rice in search of an elusive foe:

"Sometimes I think people back home don't know there is a war on in Viet Nam. My wife's neighbors don't even know where Viet Nam is."²

It was a despairing echo of the plaint of the fighting men in the Korean War a decade before. The American public learned its geography with terrifying lassitude until, in 1965, American bombers roared over North Viet Nam and American Marines landed at Da Nang. Neither soldiers nor correspondents, however, could take comfort in the sudden clamor to know what was going on in Viet Nam.

The problem is that newsmen sometimes lack the necessary background for covering the war, particularly when the newsmen are only given a few days or weeks in Saigon, or elsewhere in Viet Nam. Visitors must rely heavily on translators, official spokesmen, and dozens of other second-hand sources who may or may not be trying to sell them a bill of goods.

Before 1964, there were few newspapers that showed interest in giving the war much coverage, and only a few top newsmen visited Viet Nam. During 1964, there were only about 40 journalists in Viet Nam at any given time.³ By 1965, newspapers throughout the country began to send correspondents at their own expense to cover the war.

²Ibid., February 2, 1963.

³"Press Needs Help in Vietnam--Sylvester," Editor & Publisher, 36(September 3, 1966), p. 16.

"It is," wrote Neil Sheehan of United Press International, "a new kind of war. American officers, trained to move tanks and armored battalions in sweeping formation, have never before experienced this kind of hit-and-run war. It is a type of warfare waged on terrain which nature seems to have designed especially for guerrilla fighting."⁴

The American air strikes against North Viet Nam in 1965 brought talented war correspondents into Saigon--Peter Grose of the New York Times, Takashi Oka of the Christian Science Monitor, the durable Keyes Beech of the Chicago Daily News, Ray Herndon and Mike Malloy of UPI, Arthur Dommen of the Los Angeles Times, Bob Pearman of the Kansas City Star and others.

The most distinguished and controversial correspondents were Malcolm Wilde Browne of the AP and David Halberstam of the New York Times. Both were assigned to the hard and dangerous business of the war correspondents when they landed in Saigon in the early 1960's. Browne and Halberstam shared the Pulitzer Prize for international reporting for 1964. While Peter Grose came to Saigon for the New York Times and Halberstam in 1965 was reporting from Poland, Browne was still on the job in Saigon when the United States carried the war to North Viet Nam with a prolonged series of air assaults. It was at Browne's own request that he remained in the thick of the action.

The war correspondents could not be called frontline correspondents because there was no front line in Viet Nam. It was in

⁴Sheehan, UPI File, February 2, 1963.

the Mekong Delta one day, around Da Nang in the north on the next, at Long An Province just outside Saigon on the third, and inside the hard-pressed capital city itself on the fourth. The Viet Cong were not obliging enough to line up so they could be shot at or bombed in those days; nor did they waste their breath in empty proclamations.

Malcolm Browne distinguished himself repeatedly for his ability to think fast under pressure during the ensuing period of crisis. While most of his principal competitors moved on to new assignments, he remained on the job, covering the rise and fall of nine governments in Saigon, the cliff-hanging military career of General Ngu-yen Khanh, the U.S. naval action in Tonkin Gulf in August, 1964, and the air raids on the Communists' once-privileged sanctuary in North Viet Nam in 1965. That was action enough for any war correspondent--and too much for most.

It was Browne who photographed the Venerable Thich Quang Duc, the first bronze (Buddhist monk) to burn himself to death in the middle of a busy Saigon street on June 11, 1963. His picture helped the Buddhists focus world attention on their campaign. Millions of words had been written about the Buddhist crisis, but the picture carried an incomparable impact.⁵

Halberstam was a controversial war correspondent in Saigon. In Washington, where wags sometimes called that the Viet Nam

⁵Malcolm W. Browne, "Vietnam Preporting: Three Years of Crisis," Columbia Journalism Review, Fall, 1964, pp. 4-9.

"Halberstan's war."⁶ He was pessimistic and wrote that the war was being lost, and he was criticized for lowering and adversely affecting public opinion at home. Marguerite Higgins of the New York Herald Tribune said: "Reporters here (Saigon) would like to see us lose the war to prove they're right."⁷

Bob Pearman has been a great man for collecting hometown boys in combat. During one heliborne assault, he was the first to leave the lead chopper. And then, despite heavy shelling and Viet Cong ground fire, he was on hand to greet every chopper, yelling from a prone position "Is there anybody here from Kansas City...then how about Missouri?"⁸

Only two women correspondents were in Viet Nam in 1965; however, the roster of regulars had grown to nearly a dozen by the end of 1966. They were frequent visitors to the front lines, where reaction to their presence varied. An army sergeant once asked a woman correspondent quietly: "Will you please just say something? I have not heard an American woman speak in five months."⁹

Betsy Halstead is one of the youngest and most experienced female correspondents in Viet Nam. She was assigned to Saigon

⁶Stanley Karnow, "The Newsmen's War in Vietnam," Nieman Reports, December, 1963, pp. 3-8.

⁷Ibid., p. 7.

⁸Paul Dean, "War Correspondents Wear Badge of Courage," The Quill, 7(January, 1966), p. 12-6.

⁹"Correspondents: Femininity at the Front," Time, 18(October 28, 1966), pp. 73-4.

by the UPI in 1964. Since then, she has scored an impressive number of beats. She was the first reporter to witness and photograph a B-52 raid, and she was first to interview the mayor of Da Nang after Premier Ky called him a Communist and erroneously announced that he had fled the city.

Denby Fawcett was assigned to Saigon by the Honolulu Advertiser in the summer of 1966. She does not often cover political upheavals in the city, for she is usually chasing down frontline action. When Viet Cong bullets began spattering around her near Da Nang, she took pictures first, cover second. Once the sound of a not-too-near mortar shell prompted four Marines to fling themselves over her "protectively." Says she: "They're always doing cute things like that in the field."¹⁰

Esther Clark, 46, has been covering military affairs for the Phoenix Gazette longer than most of the Saigon newswomen have been out of grade school. She was the first woman reporter to spend a day at sea aboard a submarine, and received an Air Force award for outstanding service by a civilian. She said she stayed in Viet Nam because she felt she had to try to explain to the people at home what is going on. "I detest Saigon," she explains. "The war seems so remote from there."¹¹

Beverly Deepe who worked for the New York Herald Tribune until its demise, is now freelancing. She has logged more continuous time in Viet Nam than any other correspondent. On her way around the world in 1962, she stopped off in Saigon, then

¹⁰Ibid., p. 73. ¹¹Ibid., p. 74.

stayed on to build a reputation as an energetic reporter who preferred to operate on her own. She developed valuable contacts among the Vietnamese; her friendship with deposed Premier Nguyen Khanh, for example, won her a revealing exclusive interview in which Khanh tried to establish his own political standing by taking a militant, anti-American stand.¹² Beverly finds the "biggest challenge as a woman correspondent is that most of the American troops expect me to be a living symbol of the wives and sweethearts they left at home. They expect me to be typically American, despite cold water instead of cold cream, fatigues instead of frocks. Always it's more important to wear lipstick than a pistol."¹³

Reporters in Saigon were charged with being overly sympathetic towards the Buddhists during Diem's internal fight against his country's Buddhists in the summer of 1963. This argument was a matter of interpretation. Correspondents certainly responded to the Buddhists, whose leaders cleverly used the press as a weapon, because a burning monk made news. The Buddhist spokesman adroitly made their press relations excellent, and they did indeed use the press because international opinion was the only weapon at their disposal.

After the downfall of the Diem regime in 1963, there was a change. As the military, civilian, and Buddhist factions in South Viet Nam fought for control, the correspondents sometimes were on

¹²"Self-Reliance in Saigon," Time, 2(January 8, 1965), p. 38.

¹³"Correspondents," Time, 18(October 28, 1966), p. 74.

the verge of despair. As riots mounted to a state of war within a war, newsmen frantically sought to separate shadow from substance. If they could scarcely trust the pronouncements issued by the beleaguered Saigon government, neither could reporters trust the enigmatic Buddhist monks and cynical student leaders they sought out in the back alleys of the capital. "The students," said one correspondent, "are obviously trying to use the news media to amplify their own tiny voice and discredit Khanh's regime in the eyes of the foreign public."¹⁴

Washington Star's Richard Critchenfield says: "I don't think Tri Quang would have really existed without the American press. He has fooled an awful lot of people for a long time into thinking he speaks for the Buddhists of South Viet Nam. Now, I know he only pretends to speak for about one and a half million people" He also questions the immolations: "My impression is that these just aren't voluntary suicides."¹⁵ Says CBS's Dan Rather: "I wasn't sure before. Now I am thoroughly convinced that what we are doing out here is right."¹⁶

Among the many criticisms of correspondents as a group or as individuals, perhaps the most unfair is to say "the reporters are inexperienced"¹⁷ or "they are not doing a good enough job

¹⁴"The Viet Beat," Newsweek, 64(September 7, 1964), p. 76-7.

¹⁵"Covering Vietnam: Crud, Fret & Jeers," Time, 23(June 10, 1966), p. 54-9.

¹⁶CBS Monthly Report, May, 1966.

¹⁷"We are getting distorted reports from Vietnam...the reporters are inexperience."--Eldridge Durbrow, State Department representative in a speech in Alabama.

of getting the story through."¹⁸ To meet these criticisms, Wes Gallagher, General Manager of the Associated Press, defends reporters:

"But neither age nor experience has anything to do with reporting. Young men fight wars and die, and young correspondents must report wars and sometimes die, as they have in every war in history. They were reporting first hand--not second-guessing from Washington.

"...On the whole, Viet Nam is being better reported and more accurately reported, with less restrictions, than any war in our history, at a great price in blood and money."¹⁹

The New York Times has printed a column-long letter containing one of the sharpest attacks to date of its coverage of the war in Viet Nam. The writer was Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., a U.S. diplomat for 17 years and former U.S. Ambassador to South Viet Nam. Excerpts from his letter to the New York Times follow:

"Twice in recent months you have published news articles from your correspondent in Saigon, Charles Mohr, which tempt me to comment. In his news article about elections for the Vietnamese Constituent Assembly, Mr. Mohr said: 'It was a momentous event in the history of a people who have never had representative, honestly elected self-government.' Again, in the edition of Oct. 2, Mr. Mohr wrote from Saigon: 'The members of the Assembly have been chosen in the first really free and fair national election ever held here.' These statements, I think, carry on a tradition of misleading and prejudiced reporting on Vietnam by certain New York Times correspondents extending over a number of years.

"Your correspondent and your editors undoubtedly know of the two elections in South Vietnam (1955 and 1961) in which Ngo Dinh Diem was elected and then re-elected President of the Republic of Vietnam. You must also be aware that the National Assembly was for

¹⁸"Covering Vietnam," Time 23(June 10, 1966), p. 59.

¹⁹Wes Gallagher, AP Log, May 27, 1966.

eight years the elected legislative body of South Vietnam, functioning under the Vietnamese Constitution, until the overthrow of the Diem Government on Nov. 1, 1963. Elections as late as October, 1963--a month before a group of Vietnamese generals, encouraged by the United States Government, illegally seized power (and assassinated President Diem).

"The attempt to define representative government is as old as Plato, but, by any reasonable definition, the Vietnamese people certainly had more of it under President Diem--than they have had since his overthrow. They had a Constitution (modeled on that of the United States), they had an elected legislative body, they had a Cabinet of responsible ministers, they had a Supreme Court, they had an elected President. Even though the minds of the people had been attuned for generations to authoritarian rule, they were beginning to learn the rudiments of self-government through institutions developed during Diem's eight years as constitutional President.

"Why does The Times continue to distort the record on Vietnam? The reason, I think, is clear. The overthrow of Diem--which left a vacuum so great that 300,000 Americans and \$2 billion a month seem insufficient to fill it--was due in no small part to the influence of The Times. A weak Department of State would not stand up to the pressure. The Times attacked the Diem government directly in its editorials and inferentially in its news reports. President Kennedy became sensitive to the charge of supporting a 'Catholic' government in a 'Buddhist' country. In the fall of 1963 American support was withdrawn from President Diem, and the elected constitutional government of Vietnam was overthrown.

"Our country has been paying increasingly in blood and treasure ever since. Neither The Times nor the Administration admits this unpleasant background, but the deaths each week of 100 dutiful American soldiers should keep us from forgetting it."²⁰

The Times printed the letter without comment, however, Editorial Page Editor John B. Oakes said: "He (Nolting) has been criticizing our position for years, back to the time he

²⁰The New York Times, October 29, 1966, editorial page.

was ambassador. He tried to get us to change our position at the time. By cable, as a matter of fact."²¹

Correspondents in Viet Nam have complained bitterly of the military briefings they are given in Saigon, in an interview with U.S. News & World Report in September, 1963, Lieut. Col. John Paul Vann who quit the service to be able to speak freely, said: "There has been a lack of firsthand information (about Vietnam). Highranking people are sent there from Washington and told to get results. It becomes a kind of consuming desire on their part to show some palpable results. I believe this causes a tendency to play down the real picture." But Retired Brigadier General S. L. A. Marshall flatly contradicts them. He said: "The deplorable thing is that young writers, too lazy to gather the facts themselves, sit around and sneer at all that is said. With the conference reeking of pseudosophistication and half-baked cynicism, perspective inevitably becomes blurred. The result is an accenting of the negative and trivial story that obscures the truly important."²² "Too many U, S. newsmen," Marshall complains, "are like the TV crews who want blood on the moon every night."

Saigon newsmen have been overemphasizing day-to-day activities. "We plod along," says Freelancer Merick, "and delude the American reader by not reporting enough on such things as the rural pacification and rebuilding programs in the villages. I

²¹"Letter from Paris," Time, 19(November 4, 1966), p. 79.

²²"The Basic Flaw in Vietnam," Time, 17(October 21, 1966), p. 24.

don't think the American people are misinformed, but I think they are ill-informed."²³ It is the responsibility of the Saigon press corps, at least in part, to do what it can to remedy the situation, to get the story despite its built-in difficulties, and to tell it straight.

Television has first distinguished itself in the Vietnam war. The war has become the particular province of the news photographers and TV cameramen. The most controversial TV reporter is Morley Safer of CBS. His frontline coverage of the war in Viet Nam, often under fire and at great personal risk, has contributed mightily to an improved public awareness of the magnitude and complexity of the conflict.

Safer's courage, calmness and perception in production of sound film reports from battle scenes is in the highest tradition of television journalism. Particularly noteworthy has been his devotion to freedom of expression, without regard to political interests.

His on-the-scene descriptions of the burning of Cam Ne Village on August 3, 1965, and the death of a Vietnamese soldier on October 12, 1965, both produced under fire, are examples of outstanding feats of television reporting. His "This is what the war in Viet Nam is all about" which was an echo of CBS hero Edward R. Murrow's reporting of World War II on radio: "This is London."

²³"Covering Vietnam," Time, 23(June 10, 1966), p. 58.

Safer's famous film has been accused of distortion and of misleading the public about the behavior of American troops in Viet Nam. NBC's Chet Huntley is worried that too many TV reporters in Viet Nam concentrate far too much on Safer-like shots, the kind of flaming action that ensures an appearance on the air at home. The military thinks that too many correspondents are out there for their "own personal aggrandizement." ABC's Howard K. Smith, after a visit to Viet Nam in September, 1966, took the same tack. During the Buddhist demonstrations in 1966, he said, "television gave the impression that the whole country was rioting, instead of 2,000 out of 17 million." Television, he complained, "still gives the impression that it is an American war out there. You never see a Vietnamese action." His colleagues, he said, were completely ignoring all the work of pacification. They look for what will get on the air, "and that's bang, bang, bang. We're missing all the nation building.

There is no censorship of the press nor any practice of news management in Viet Nam, the only news management that goes on is in the newsroom back home.²⁴ There are, for security purposes only, a few restrictions agreed upon by both the military and newsmen. Senator Gale McGee, Wyoming, said in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee August 31, 1966, that he was satisfied with the flow of information from Viet Nam, and that a reporter who has covered both that conflict and World War II told him that censorship was much tighter in the latter war.

²⁴"Press Needs Help," Editor & Publisher, 36(September 3, 1966), p. 17.

However, there is a serious difference between the U.S. military command and American journalists that lay in their divergent interpretation of how the war should be reported. The former prefers war correspondents to take an optimistic view of the situation in Viet Nam, the latter thinks that their job is to record the truth, whether it is good or bad. In other words, correspondents want to tell the whole story. There is a logical ground for correspondents, namely, the public has a right to know. It can be argued that truth would damage the national interest in such a way. As Newsweek pointed out:

"Nowadays, the journalist...is still abused for spreading unhappy truths. And indeed, by some curious twist of logic, it has even become the fashion to hold him responsible for the very events he describes."²⁵

Nine correspondents met their death in the Viet Nam war. The latest one was Ronald D. Gallagher, 29, a free-lance photographer from Fort Scott, Kansas, who was killed on March 11, 1967, when artillery shells fired from an American battery accidentally rained on their own troops during a Viet Cong attack. He had been free-lancing for his hometown paper, the Fort Scott Tribune, and for the Topeka Daily Capital and State Journal, and the Joplin (Mo.) Globe. The incident occurred about 14 miles southwest of Saigon during a helicopter assault by the 9th Infantry Division. Four soldiers were killed.

Gallagher was born in Coffeyville, Kansas, and graduated from the University of Kansas School of Journalism, where he

²⁵"South Vietnam: The Break-Even Point," Newsweek, 62 (December 2, 1963), pp. 57-8.

was managing editor of the campus newspaper in his senior year. He went to Viet Nam in December, 1966, and had planned to stay from six to eight months. He was the first Kansas correspondent to be killed in the Viet Nam war.²⁶

The first American correspondent to die while covering the war was Bernard Kolenberg, an Albany-Times Union photographer who was on leave from the newspaper working for the Associated Press. Kolenberg was killed in the crash of two Skyraiders on a mission over Viet Nam October 2, 1965. Kolenberg, 38, had returned to the war zone just a month before, after a six-week tour there the previous summer for his newspaper.

Prior to Kolenberg's death, a Swiss cameraman, P. Van Thiel, was reported killed in May, 1965, after being tortured by the Viet Cong.

Jack Rose, a free-lancer and former Time correspondent, died in a civilian air crash while in Viet Nam in April, 1965.

On October 13, 1965, Huyn Thanh My, a Vietnamese photographer working for the AP, was killed in the Mekong delta by Viet Cong gunfire. He was 29, and had been wounded the previous May while on assignment.

On November 4, 1965, Dickey Chapelle, 47, a reporter-photographer whose career covering wars dated back to World War II Pacific campaign, died several hours after being wounded by a concealed mine.

²⁶"Newsman 9th to Die in Vietnam," Kansas City Star, March 11, 1967, p. 1.

Chapelle was then on assignment for the National Observer and WOR-radio (New York) and was with a Marine division near Chulai airbase. In 1962 she had received the George Polk Memorial Award from the Overseas Press Club for her outstanding reporting.

There was a ceremony marking the dedication of the Dickey Chapelle Memorial Dispensary in Viet Nam on November 4, 1966, honoring this woman war correspondent and photographer who was killed in action. Jim Lucas spoke at the ceremony at the Chu Lai New Life hamlet near where she had died. Lt. Gen. Lewis Walt, USMC attended the ceremony. Lucas said:

"It is a high privilege to speak on behalf of the dead.

"It is a solemn responsibility when that person is a revered member of the press, our colleague and beloved friend.

"Most of us here knew and loved Dickey Chapelle. Those who did not must feel that they did. Dickey was one of our legends. Unlike many legends, she rang true. There was nothing phoney about Dickey Chapelle. The stories we hear and tell about this unique woman were true. They suffer, if anything, in the re-telling, because Dickey could not be recaptured in words or in pictures.

"I knew Dickey longer than either of us cared to admit. Our paths crossed in Korea, in Lebanon, in the Dominican Republic and in Viet Nam. But there were places where they did not cross, because Dickey went where the bravest of us dared not go.

"We were never very surprised to learn that Dickey had disappeared from her hotel room in Vienna and turned up in an Iron Curtain country jail--which she did--or that she had been nabbed trying to sneak into Fidel Castro's Cuba, and that happened to her, too.

"Her death, near this very spot, was a blow to the heart. We loved this gal...this fierce competitor...this spifire.

"I can almost hear her voice now--strident, demanding, yet totally without rancor. There was no guile, no spitefulness, in Dickey. She gave a great deal more than she took measure of greatness.

"Dickey was a great photographer. The whole world recognized that fact. Yet she seemed not to know, or care, about her greatness. She never let us off easy. She made us look. None could look on her work--her art--without knowing and feeling more than before.

"Dickey Chapelle was a Marine. But she was also Dickey Chapelle, person. Some say they forgot Dickey was female. Dickey was one hell of a girl. She simply refused to trade on her femininity. She didn't need to. She beat us to death. We couldn't keep up with her. We ceased to try.

"Knowing Dickey, I suspect that she would detest what we are doing here today. Ceremonies are slightly pompous, and Dickey was never pompous. Several years ago, I attended ceremonies on Ie Shima honoring the late Ernie Pyle on the anniversary of his death. There were speeches. There was a band and an honor guard. A representative of the Emperor of Japan laid a wreath at the spot where Ernie Pyle died. In the midst of that solemn occasion, I imagined I could hear Ernie yelling: 'What in the hell goes on here?'

"I burst out laughing.

"So, as much as we mourn Dickey, let's not pull a long face for her. We miss her, but she is gone. And this dispensary is her memorial.

"You were a damned fool, Dickey Chapelle, to take the chances you took.

"But you wouldn't have been yourself if you hadn't.

"So, for now, it's 'So long, Dickey Chapelle.'

"We'll be seeing you."²⁷

²⁷ Jim G. Lucas, "We Loved This Gal...This Spitfire," Scripps-Howard News, 4(January, 1967), pp. 6-7.

San Castan, Look Magazine's senior editor in Hong Kong, was killed in action May 21, 1966, in the highlands of Viet Nam. He was covering the First Cavalry Division's "Operation Crazy Horse." His death was attributed to mortar fire.

Castan, 31, had been covering Viet Nam for the magazine since 1963, with time out for trips to Cyprus and Dominican Republic during the worst of the fighting in those areas.

Castan received a Sigma Delta Chi award in 1964 for his distinguished service in journalism, for his best magazine reporting, and for his articles on Viet Nam. "Risking his life, Castan made a significant contribution to public knowledge," Sigma Delta Chi said.

After one of Castan's trips to Viet Nam, an Army major wrote to the editor of Look: "The purpose of this letter is to relate to you the gallant bravery of M. Castan when under mortar, automatic weapons, and small arms fire delivered from close range. Based on demonstrated courage, he would qualify as an excellent soldier in any army. He exposed himself to hostile fire repeatedly in an effort to record the action accurately and I was personally proud to observe this reporter in action."

Castan had great contempt for those who covered the war from the safety of Saigon. He believed in getting the "feel" of this war and what it meant to America and Americans. He lived with servicemen both in combat and in their off-hours and once wrote about them:

"Ready for a raid, the pilots looked like young gladiators. But when the raid was over, when they took off their uniforms and went to the debriefing room, they revealed little paunches and greying hair. Suddenly they looked more like mill-hands coming home from a day's grinding work. They feel a relative detachment about the war, mostly because they don't see the results of their bombing. They are real professionals."

On another occasion, Castan wrote:

"When I landed in the jungle with the 173rd Airborne Brigade, I was among very young and relatively inexperienced foot soldiers. The United States has never really fought a jungle war, and the effect of that kind of fighting on a man unprepared for it can be terrible. Hatred builds up without any relief and leads to a kind of terrorism that a person who has never been there would hardly believe possible. Seeing these two extremes of the war was a disturbing experience for me."²⁸

On January 3, 1966, Marguerite Higgins died in Walter Reed Hospital, Washington, D. C., from an infection contracted while on tour of Southeast Asia. She was hospitalized in November, 1965, on returning from Viet Nam. She had won a Pulitzer Prize and the Polk award for her coverage of the Korean war in 1950 while a correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune. She had been writing from Asia for the Garden City (New York) Newsday.

Charles Chellappah, 26, died after being shot in the head while on patrol with U.S. infantrymen on February 14, 1967, near Cu Chi. Chellappah was a free-lance photographer from Singapore on assignment for the AP. One of his pictures, taken just a few days before his death, won a prize in National Press Photographers Association competition.

²⁸Richard S. Collins, "Sam Castan--Vietnam Was a Way of Life and, Ultimately, a Way of Death," The Quill, 7(July, 1966), p. 38.

The Viet Nam war is a strange, reluctant commitment. As the small, far-off war has grown bigger and closer, it stirs little of the fervor with which Americans went off to battle in 1917 or 1941. The issues are complex and controversial. The U.S. is not even formally at war with its enemy.

The risk and the responsibility for the war, as given by President Johnson in July, 1965, is: "We will stand in Viet Nam." Thereafter, the President moved resolutely to make good that pledge, weathering open criticism from within his own party, strident protest from what was dubbed the "Vietnik"²⁹ fringe, and the disapprobation of friendly nations from the Atlantic to the China Sea.

In the process, American troops gave an incalculable lift to South Viet Nam's disheartened people and divided the government. And, important as that was, they helped preserve a far greater stake than South Viet Nam itself. As the Japanese demonstrated when they seized Indo-China on the eve of World War II, whoever holds the peninsula holds the gate to Asia. Were Hanoi to conquer the South and unify it under the Communist regime, Cambodia and Laos would tumble immediately. After that, the U.S. would be forced to fight from a less advantageous position in Thailand to hold the rest of Southeast Asia. "If you lose Asia," says General Pierre Gallois, a French strategist, "you lose the Pacific lake. It is an extraordinary problem, the problem of the next 20 years."

²⁹This word is coined by Time and refers to the anti-war group.

In Washington, the doves urged a halt in the bombing on the strength of a tentative promise from Hanoi to negotiate; the administration insists on some solid reciprocal move from the North--not a mere promise. Senator William Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee says: "It is an emotional and intellectual reluctance to believe that Communism is a monolithic doctrine of belligerence based on a fanatical dream of world domination." George F. Kennan, who retired from the State Department in 1963, former U.S. Ambassador to Moscow and a leading exponent of the "containment" policy that was designed to defend Europe against Soviet expansionism in the late 1940's believes that resisting Communist aggression in Southeast Asia is "not our business."

In the Fulbright committee's televised hearings on the war in February, 1966, Idaho's Frank Church insisted that South Viet Nam was experiencing an "internal revolution," even though North Vietnamese troops are present, just as the U.S. experienced an internal revolution, even though there were "French revolutionary soldiers at Valley Forge." Rusk found that comparison hard to swallow. "I cannot identify for a moment," said he in the committee, "the purposes of the Hanoi-inspired revolution of the 1960's with purposes of the American Revolution in the 1770's."

New York's Senator Jacob Javits, a liberal Republican and sometime critic of the U.S. role in Viet Nam, told the committee after a week's visit to Saigon that most South Vietnamese now believe, as they plainly did not a year ago, the Viet Cong will

be defeated--possibly in as little as two years. He says:

"I believe the struggle in Viet Nam is worthy of the U.S. I believe it is worthy of the cause of freedom. I believe it needs to be waged and I believe it deserves the support of the liberals. South Viet Nam is the zone of contact in the struggle for the freedom of Asia, and those who see it as anything else are fooling themselves."

How do the South Vietnamese people feel about the controversial war? In many ways, the people of South Viet Nam are not unlike the rest of the world in the way they view the war. They want to get it over with, but they're not sure about the best way to go about it. According to the survey³⁰ three out of every five South Vietnamese in secure areas feel the U.S. should concentrate more on trying to find a way to negotiate with North Viet Nam than on extending the U.S. military action against the North. One out of seven wants more military action. Thus, it becomes clear that South Viet Nam has its own distinct set of hawks and doves. Two groups emerge, one which is militantly victory-oriented, which wants peace through a greater military effort; the other, which wants the war over with, but is not as ready with a clear plan to end it.

Never before has the U.S. war correspondent reported a three-front war as he does today. They have to cover the efforts of the fighting soldiers, the pacification work in Viet Nam, and the home-front war between "hawks" and "doves."

³⁰"The People of South Vietnam: How they feel about War,"
A CBS News Public Opinion Survey, March 13, 1967, SI-S8.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

In reading the war correspondence of the last one hundred years of the war correspondents, in reading their own accounts of their experiences and the biographies that friends have written, and in comparing this material with the corresponding material of the present day, it seems clear that the historian finds its value affected by the personal equation of the correspondent, but still more that its authoritativeness must be judged by the period in which he worked.

In the early period, a correspondent waited for the issue of the battle to become evident; then he wrote his account of what he had himself witnessed. If no favors were shown the early correspondent and no opportunities given him, he had at least the opportunity of making opportunity for himself.

During the second period, the social status of the war correspondent changed; he was honored and recognized as a person of importance and influence. The inevitable result of this changed status of the war correspondent was that war correspondence came to be regarded as a stepping-stone to social preferment.

The difficulties of the recent period are still too much in the foreground to have been as yet adequately evaluated because of all the conflicting interests involved. The type of war,

whether civil war, rebellion against a home country, or a war of aggression, will always affect the type of war correspondence and therefore its authoritativeness. As wars differ among themselves, so also do countries and readers differ, and the opinion has been expressed that war correspondents influence public opinion far more in America or in England than they do in France or in Germany.

The effect of war on daily life, on business, on industry, on education, on manufacturing, on social conditions are best evaluated, and indeed only perhaps, through the press. The real success of the war correspondent today depends on his ability to report these conditions rather than on his opportunity to give information in regard to military action. If the place of the war correspondent seems somewhat less important than it formerly was, the change is not due entirely to an autocratic censor, to the disfavor of military commanders, or to the sensitiveness of political leaders. War itself is changing, histories of war are changing, and the war correspondent is changing with them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Arnold, Matthew. Friendship's Garland. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1903.
- Barrett, James Wyman. Joseph Pulitzer & His World. New York: The Vanguard Press, Inc., 1941.
- Beech, Keyes. Tokyo and Points East. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1954.
- Berger, Meyer. The Story of the New York Times. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1951.
- Bowman, W. D. The Story of the Times. London: The Macmillan Company, 1941.
- Buliard, F. Lauriston. Famous War Correspondents. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1941.
- . Canham, Erwin D. Commitment to Freedom; the Story of the Christian Science Monitor. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958.
- . Cook, Edward, K.E.B. The Press in War Time. London: The Macmillan Company, 1920.
- . Cooper, Kent. Kent Cooper and the Associated Press. New York: Random House, Inc., 1959.
- Creelman, James. On the Great High Way. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1901.
- Cross, Harold L. Freedom of Information. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.
- . Davis, Richard Harding. Notes of a War Correspondent. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933.
- Desmond, Robert W. The Press and World Affairs. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1937.
- Dibblee, G. B. The Newspaper. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.

- Downey, Fairfax. Richard Harding Davis: His Day. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933.
- Escott, T. H. S. Masters of English Journalism. London: T. F. Unwin, 1911.
- Fenton, Charles A. The Apprenticeship of Ernest Hemingway: the Early Years. New York: Farrar, Strause and Cudahy, Inc., 1954.
- Forbes, Archibald. Memories and Studies of War and Peace. London: Johnston, 1896.
- Gramling, Oliver. AP: The Story of News. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1940.
- _____. Free Men Are Fighting; the Story of World War II. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1942.
- Hartwell, Dickson, and Andrew A. Rooney. Off the Record; the Best Stories of Foreign Correspondents. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1953.
- Hearst, William Randolph. William Randolph Hearst; A Portrait of His Own Words. Edited by Edmond D. Coblenz. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1952.
- Heaton, John Langdon. The Story of a Page; Thirty Years of Public Service and Public Discussion in the Editorial Columns of the New York World. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1917.
- Higgins, Marguerite. War in Korea--Report of a Woman Combat Correspondent. New York: Harper & Row, 1953.
- Hohenberg, John. The Pulitzer Prize Story. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- _____. Foreign Correspondence; the Great Reports and Their Times. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.
- _____. The New Front Page. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.
- Hutton, Oram C., and Andrew A. Rooney. The Stars and Stripes. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., 1946.
- Jones, Robert W. Journalism in the United States. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, Inc., 1947.

- Lee, James Melvin. History of American Journalism. Rev. ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1923.
- Leech, Margaret. In the Days of McKinley. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.
- Lyons, Eugene. We Cover the World, by Fifteen Foreign Correspondents. Edited by Eugene Lyons. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1937.
- McNamara, John. Extra, U.S. War Correspondents in Action. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1945.
- Miller, Lee G. The Story of Ernie Pyle. New York: The Viking Press, Inc., 1950.
- Miller, Webb. I Found No Peace; the Journal of a Foreign Correspondent. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1936.
- Morris, Joe Alex. Deadline Every Minute; the Story of the United Press. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1957.
- Mott, Frank Luther. American Journalism; a History of Newspapers in the United States. 4th ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964.
- Napier, W. F. P. History of the War in the Peninsula. London: The Macmillan Company, 1882.
- _____. Memoirs of Henry Villard. London: The Macmillan Company, 1882.
- O'Brien, Frank M. The Story of the Sun: 1833-1918. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1918.
- Older, Mrs. Fremont. William Randolph Hearst, American. Rev. ed. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1952.
- Peterson, H. C. Propaganda for War; the Campaign Against American Neutrality, 1914-1917. Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1939.
- Powell, E. Alexander. Slanting Lines of Steel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933.
- Ralph, Julian. The Making of a Journalist. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1903.
- Robinson, Henry C. Reminiscences and Correspondents. London: The Macmillan Company, 1869.

- Rucker, Bruce W. Twentieth Century Reporting at its Best. Ames, Iowa, University of Iowa Press, 1964.
- Seitz, Don C. Joseph Pulitzer: His Life and Letters. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1924.
- Smalley, G. W. Anglo-Saxon Memories. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911.
- Stewart, Kenneth Norman. Makers of Modern Journalism. New York: Prentice Hall, 1952.
- Swanberg, W. A. Citizen Hearst. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961.
- Swope, Herbert Bayard. Inside the German Empire. New York: A. L. Burt Company, 1917.
- Times, The. History of the Times. London: The Times, 1952.
- William, J. B. History of English Journalism. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1908.
- Williams, Wythe. Dusk Empire; the Decline of Europe and the Rise of the United States, as Observed by a Foreign Correspondant in a Quarter Century of Service. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937.
- Wisan, Joseph E. The Cuban Crisis as Reflected in the New York Press. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.

ARTICLES and PERIODICALS

Associated Press File, May 11-12, 1945.

_____, December 25-8, 1950.

_____, December 5, 1952.

Bental, Dwight. "War Climax Gives Press Its Biggest News Week,"
Editor & Publisher, 20(May 12, 1945), p. 7.

Browne, Malcolm W. "Vietnam Reporting: Three Years of Crisis,"
Columbia Journalism Review, Fall, 1964, pp. 4-9.

Chicago Daily News, December 11, 1950, p. 2.

"Code for Korea," Newsweek, 40(December 23, 1952), p. 71.

Collier's, September, 1940, p. 65.

Collins, Richard S. "Sam Casten--Vietnam Was a Way of Life and
Ultimately, a Way of Death," The Quill, 7(July, 1966), p. 38.

Columbia Broadcasting System Monthly Report, September, 1940.

_____, May, 1966.

"Correspondents at Bay," Time, 58(July 23, 1951), p. 41.

"Correspondents: Femininity at the Front," Time, 18(October 28,
1966), pp. 73-4.

"Covering Vietnam: Crud, Fret & Jeers," Time, 23(June 10, 1966),
pp. 54-9.

Dean, Paul. "War Correspondents Wear Badge of Courage," The
Quill, 1(January, 1966), pp. 12-6.

Editor & Publisher. January 2, 1915, No. 14, p. 582.

_____. February 27, 1915, No. 14, p. 751.

_____. January 8, 1916, No. 48, p. 871.

_____. April 8, 1916, No. 48, p. 1343.

_____. July 8, 1916, No. 49, p. 6.

Fourth Estate, August 29, 1914, No. 1017, p. 2.

_____, June 17, 1916, No. 1164, p. 14.

Gallagher, Wes. Associated Press Log, May 27, 1966.

International News Report, October 19, 1917.

"Kaesong Coverage," Newsweek, 38(July 30, 1951), p. 64.

Karnow, Stanley. "The Newsmen's War in Vietnam," Nieman Reports, December, 1963, pp. 12-6.

"Kennedy V-E Beat Stirs Three-Point Controversy," Editor & Publisher, 20(May 12, 1945), p. 10.

Landon, Perceval. "War Correspondents and the Censorship," 19th Century and After, 52(August, 1902), pp. 327-37.

"Letters from Paris," Time, 19(November 4, 1966), p. 79.

Lucas, Jim G. "We Loved This Gal...This Spitfire," Scripps-Howard News. 4(January, 1967), pp. 6-7.

"Needed: A Rule Book," Time, 56(July 24, 1950), p. 58.

"Newsman 9th to Die in Vietnam," Kansas City Star, March 11, 1967, p. 1.

New York Times, The, August 19, 1914.

_____, November 16, 1914.

_____, May 24, 1915.

_____, September 8, 1940, p. 8.

_____, October 29, 1966, editorial page.

New York Tribune, The, November 8, 1918, editorial page.

Pinkley, Virgil. "Correspondent Corps Is Set for Invasion Coverage--500 Reporters Expected," Editor & Publisher, 22(May 27, 1944), p. 5.

"Press Needs Help in Vietnam--Sylvester," Editor & Publisher, 36(September 3, 1966), p. 16.

"Pride of the Regiment," Time, 56(September 25, 1950), pp. 63-4.

"Robert Herrick's Indictment of American War Correspondents," Current Opinion, 59(October, 1915), p. 265.

Robinson, H. Perry. "A War Correspondent on His Work," 19th Century and After, 82(December, 1917), pp. 1205-15.

Schneider, Walter E. "U.S. War Staffs on All Fronts Face Toughest Job in 4th Year--Coverage Problems and Risks in Global Conflict," Editor & Publisher, 37(September 12, 1942), pp. 5-6.

_____. "War Staffs Abroad at New Peak for 2nd Year of U.S. Offensive--Reporters Total 370, Photographers 65, 50 Press Groups Have Men Overseas," Editor & Publisher, 16(April 17, 1943), p. 19.

Schuyler, Philip. "U.S. Press, Well Prepared, Covers Invasion in Stride," Editor & Publisher, 24(June 10, 1944), p. 9.

"Self-Reliance in Saigon," Time, 2(January 8, 1965), p. 38.

"Seven Times No," Newsweek, 36(August 28, 1950), p. 54.

Sheehan, Neil. UPI File, Saigon, January 20, 1963.

_____, February 2, 1963.

"Skeleton in the Newspaper Closet," Literary Digest, 51(September 18, 1915), pp. 592-3.

"South Vietnam: The Break-Even Point," Newsweek, 62(December 2, 1963), pp. 57-8.

Strunsky, S. "War Notes from a Newspaper Desk," Atlantic Monthly, 116(September, 1915), pp. 401-10.

"The Basic Flaw in Vietnam," Time, 17(October 21, 1966), p. 21.

"The People of South Vietnam: How they Feel About the War," A CBS News Public Opinion Survey, March 13, 1967. S1-S8.

"The Viet Beat," Newsweek, 64(September 7, 1964), pp. 76-7.

"This Ain't Good," Newsweek, 36(July 24, 1950), p. 47.

"Throwing the Rule Book," Time, 57(January 22, 1951), pp. 70-2.

Villard, O. G. "Press as affected by the War," Review of Reviews, 51(January, 1915), pp. 79-83.

"War Correspondents," Newsweek, 17(April 26, 1943), p. 20.

_____, Time, 44(August 7, 1944), p. 64.

WAR NEWS COVERAGE
A STUDY OF ITS DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

by

PUNLEY HUSTON YANG
B.L., NATIONAL CHENGCHI UNIVERSITY
Taipei, Taiwan, China, 1961

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Technical Journalism

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

1968

The developments of war correspondence in the history of American journalism began with the Mexican War in 1846 to 1848. George W. Kendall is honored as being "the first modern war correspondent." The American Civil War brought war correspondents into active service and competition. During the war with Spain, the American war correspondent reached his highest development.

World War I fell into the period of sensational and adventurous journalism. During that time there was an almost complete absence of the analytical type of article with its searching inquiry into the strategic, political, economic, and social backgrounds of world events. The war correspondents of that time were not prepared for that type of job. They knew little of military matters and not much about economic or political problems and trends.

The war reporting of World War II became as different from war reporting during World War I as war correspondents in general during the first conflict had been different from war correspondents of previous periods.

The decisive difference, however, between war correspondents of World War I and World War II lay in the fact that the later war was a total war. The war had fronts at home as well as abroad. That situation meant that the war correspondents no longer had only to entertain, for they had principally to inform. Furthermore, they had to inform people who felt themselves part of the struggle. War correspondents had become intelligence

officers who communicated news from one part of the front to another.

Less than five years after the Japanese surrender, American war correspondents were assigned to cover the Korean "police action." Their reports were journalistic epilogues concerning the long and weary conflicts which introduced many difficult elements into the reporting of a war. Despite great efforts made by the best correspondents, they were never able to explain the war cogently to the nation.

Covering the Viet Nam war is difficult, because the war itself is the most confusing and the most controversial in American history. The war correspondents cannot be called front-line correspondents because there is no front line in Viet Nam. The fighting can break out anywhere.

In Viet Nam, however, the actual clashes are probably less important than the subtle thinking of people and the social upheaval in the United States. These phenomena are difficult to convey in words, and for a reader to digest. All of these imponderables leave huge gaps for claims of any kind by the South or North Vietnamese, by "hawks" or "doves," by the government, or by those against the war.

The Viet Nam war is a strange, reluctant commitment. As the small, far-off war has grown bigger and closer, it stirs little of the fervor with which Americans went off to battle in 1917 or 1941. The issues are complex and controversial. The United States is not even formally at war with the opponent.

Never before has the American war correspondent reported a three-front war as he does today. He has to cover the efforts of the fighting soldiers, the pacification work in Viet Nam, and the home-front war between "hawks" and "doves."

